

102051

JPRS-UWE-85-003

5 March 1985

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

19991008 104

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

1
67
A 04

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

NOTICE

A new serial entitled WORLDWIDE REPORT: ARMS CONTROL will be published starting in March 1985.

The new report will contain Soviet, European, and other foreign media reportage and commentary on arms control issues, negotiations, agreements, and treaties. Much of the material will be reprinted from the regional FBIS DAILY REPORTS.

U.S. Government consumers may arrange to receive the new report through regular publications distribution channels or by contacting:

FBIS/Liaison and Requirements
P.O. Box 2604
Washington, D.C. 20013

Other consumers may order the report by contacting:

National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161

5 March 1985

USSR REPORT

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal **MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA** published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| English Summaries of Major Articles in MEMO Journal (pp 158-159)..... | 1 |
| USSR 'Struggle for Peace' Contrasted with U.S. Policy (pp 3-14) (Yu. Mel'nikov)..... | 5 |
| U.S.-West European Differences on Military Policy Highlighted (pp 15-14) (G. Vorontsov)..... | 19 |
| CEMA Intensification, Specialization, Integration Urged (pp 25-34) (Yu. Belyayev)..... | 31 |
| Political Development of Ethiopian Revolution Detailed (35-47) (Ye. Denisov)..... | 38 |
| The System of Neocolonial Exploitation (pp 48-59) (I. Dmitriyev) (not translated) | |
| New Trends in the Realm of International Capitalist Credit (pp 60-72) (S. Gorbunov) (not translated) | |
| Administrative-Financial Reform -- the Japanese Version of Neo-Conservatism (pp 73-85) (I. Tselishchev) (not translated) | |

GLORIOUS ANNIVERSARIES

GDR Anniversary Article Stresses 'Socialist Solidarity' (pp 86-93)
(G. Kirillov)..... 47

CRITICISM OF BOURGEOIS THEORIES

The Neo-Conservative Economic Theory and Practices of 'Reaganomics'
(pp 95-105)
(P. Vostrikov) (not translated)

OUR COMMENTARIES

Ireland -- Alarming Symptoms (108-111)
(O. Shakhnazarov) (not translated)

SURVEYS, INFORMATION

West German Companies under Blows of Crisis (112-118)
(V. Lapshin) (not translated)

'The Laffer Curve' -- The Conception and Realities of Politics
(pp 119-125)
(V. Volobuyev) (not translated)

WE ANSWER READERS' QUESTIONS

The Federal Reserve System and Regulation of the U.S. Loan Capital
Market (pp 126-129)
(S. Pyatenko) (not translated)

BOOKS, AUTHORS

IMEMO Series on Capitalist States: Volume on France (pp 130-132)
(A. Salmin)..... 54

Yu. Shishkov review of "Theories of 'Open Economics': Doctrines and
Reality" by A. Yu. Yudanov (pp 132-133) (not translated)

B. Maklyarskiy review of "State of the World 1984. A Worldwatch
Institute Report on Progress Toward a Sustainable Society" (pp 134-136)
(not translated)

V. Strezhnev review of "Urgent Problems of International Security and
Disarmament." Edited by V.S. Shaposhnikov (pp 136-137)
(not translated)

A. Arbatov Book on Strategic Parity Reviewed (pp 138-140)
(A. Likhotal')..... 58

M. Ashitkov review of "Defense Economics" by Gavin Kennedy (pp 140-142)
(not translated)

V. Zelenin review of "Canada: Specific Features of Its Industrial Development" by V. V. Popov (pp 142-143) (not translated)

M. Belyayev review of "Contemporary Transnational Corporations. Statistical-Economic Manual" (pp 143-145) (not translated)

STATISTICS

Foreign Trade of the CEMA Member-Countries and the Common Market (pp 146-157) (not translated)

ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF MAJOR ARTICLES

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNIYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 11,
Nov 84 pp 158-159

[Summaries of articles in English: "The Issue in Brief"]

[Text] The article "Peaceful Coexistence and the Struggle for Man's Right to Live" by Yu. Mel'nikov is dedicated to the struggle of the Soviet Union for peaceful coexistence ever since the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The article emphasizes that the great founder of our state, V.I. Lenin considered top priority the task of creating peaceful conditions for the construction of socialism, its historic competition with capitalism, and provision of man's basic right -- the right to exist. The article notes that by their refusal to recognize and follow the principle of peaceful coexistence, the leading imperialist powers have more than once brought about an increased military threat, aggression, and wars. Today, once again an alarming situation has arisen in the world as a result of the stubborn efforts of the U.S. ruling circles to change military and strategic parity with the USSR in their own favor through the policy of force and the arms race, and to undermine the struggle of peoples for national and social liberation. Decisively rebuffing the militaristic course of American imperialism and its allies, the USSR repeatedly warns all nations and governments against the possible consequences of such a course. The USSR, side by side with the socialist states and all peaceloving and progressive forces, is intensifying the struggle to avert a world thermonuclear war which threatens to destroy life on earth.

G. Vorontsov, in the article "The USA, NATO, and Euromissiles" exposes the mounting international tension that stems from the policy pursued by those U.S. quarters which have been trying to gain military superiority over the USSR. The deployment of American medium-range missiles in Western Europe is the result of those plans. The article examines the present stage of relations between the United States and its NATO allies, which is characterized by an aggravation of international tension caused by deployment of the American first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Much attention is paid in the article to the evolution in the last few years of the American and Western European concepts of "defense" and nuclear weapons deployment. The author shows the growing contradictions between the Western Europeans and Washington, which seeks to turn the former into its hostages in

"limited nuclear war". The article stresses the importance of Soviet peace initiatives, the realization of which would serve as a real alternative to the dangerous escalation of the arms race. These initiatives would bring about a situation and atmosphere in the world in which realistic international agreements could be reached.

CEMA countries have entered the 1980's with substantially consolidated economic, scientific, and technical potential. They have carried out major social programs, ensuring stable growth in the people's living standards and the future development of science, education, culture, public health, and social security. In the article "The Industrial Potential of Socialism and Some Ways to Realize It Effectively," Yu. Belyayev focuses his attention on the fact that in the past 20 years the CEMA countries have developed at a rate which exceeds the growth of world industrial output; this has turned them into one of the largest industrial-economic regions of the world. Their comparatively high growth rate, one of the most important advantages of socialist economies over capitalist ones, clearly speaks for the stability of socialist economies. The author notes that accelerating scientific and technological progress and raising its effectiveness constitute the present-day strategic line. The article points out that CEMA international cooperation in the 1980's faces new demands: to properly choose the forms and directions of cooperation. The CEMA countries favor the development of the most extensive international ties on the basis of equality, noninterference, and mutual benefit. Their economic relations favorably affect the international economic situation. Expanding mutually advantageous cooperation throughout the world, the CEMA countries counter the policy of reactionary imperialist circles which undermine the relaxation of international tension.

Ye. Denisov in the article "Ethiopia -- A Step into the Future" outlines the path covered by the Ethiopian national-democratic revolution, the 10th Anniversary of which was marked on 12 September 1984 by the working people of that country. Envoys of the communist and workers' parties and representatives of national liberation movements and international organizations from more than 70 countries were present. Tremendous changes have taken place in these years in the economic, social, cultural, and political fields. The Provisional Military Administrative Council of Ethiopia has radically transformed the backward, prerevolutionary state mechanism. It has carried out progressive reforms in industry and agriculture with priorities given to the state sector. Conditions have been created in the country for broader participation of the working people in economic management, in control over production, and in political and public life. The Constitutional Congress of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia (WPE) has become a historic event in the life of the country. Ethiopia advanced to this event along a difficult path, overcoming the fierce resistance of internal and external counterrevolution. The program documents of the WPE endorsed by the congress (the Program and Rules) determine the prospects and general trends of development of Ethiopian society. The final goal set by the WPE is to create the material, social, cultural, and political conditions necessary to convert to building the basis of the future socialist society.

I. Dmitriyev in the article "The System of Neocolonial Exploitation" stresses that the second half of the 20th Century was marked by the decisive

achievements of the liberation movement. The heightening role and importance of the newly-emergent countries in international relations has become an important factor. Forms of collective defense of their interests have taken shape. In the mid-1970's these countries launched a program to establish a new international economic order -- a far-reaching plan, the progressive propositions of which are supported by the socialist countries. The article points out that imperialism is displeased with the fact that the newly-emergent states are gradually consolidating their independence. It shows how transnational monopolies together with bourgeois states have managed to invent a new neocolonial mechanism to exploit them, trying to bind these countries to themselves in order to more freely exploit their natural riches and use their territory for their own (imperialist) strategic purposes, because the newly-emergent states still remain within the capitalist system of economy, in a subordinate position. The author exposes the mechanism of capitalist exploitation: direct foreign investments, outflow of profits and debt payments, terms of trade, service payments, the gunboat policy mechanism, and so forth. In its Declaration on Maintenance of Peace and International Economic Cooperation, the Economic Summit Conference of the CEMA countries held in Moscow in June 1984 declared that the CEMA countries support the progressive demands of the developing states in their struggle for economic decolonization, for ensuring their complete sovereignty over their natural and other resources and their economic activity, for their broad and equal participation in solving international economic problems, for an end to the outflow of capital, and so forth. They advocate an early start to global talks on the most important international economic problems within the United Nations framework.

I. Tselishchev in the paper "Administrative and Financial Reform -- the Japanese Version of Neoconservatism" writes that Japan is presently going through administrative and financial reform with repercussions on almost all aspects of the socioeconomic and political life of the country. This reform can be regarded as an expression of the ruling circles' reaction to the current crisis of the state regulation mechanism and the declining efficiency of governmental measures undertaken according to Keynesian prescriptions. The reform which has been initiated is a direct application of neoconservative trends in economic theory and practical policy. The reform is aimed at radically slashing budget spending, reducing the state sector in the economy, and reorganizing the administrative apparatus. In other words, it is a drastic revision of the role of state intervention in economic matters with respect to the scope and main goals of this intervention. Though it reveals common features with neoconservative tendencies in other industrial capitalist countries, the Japanese experience proves to be of a special nature. The author identifies the specific factors that have brought about the reform in Japan and provides a brief review of its targets, taking into account the strategy options open to Japanese business as a number of sectors of the national economy become private sectors. The paper concludes with some general comments on the prospects of administrative and financial reform, pinpointing the more advantageous conditions for neoconservative proponents in Japan as compared to other capitalist countries. But more highly efficient reformist moves can be achieved at the expense of vast democratic masses which would oppose the attack on their vital interests.

The gigantic pyramid of international debts menacing the world capitalist economy jeopardizes both borrowers and creditors. Western politicians, bankers, and economists strive to restore the disturbed equilibrium in the monetary domain, emphasizing the international character of the threat which has emerged. In the article "New Trends in the Sphere of International Capitalist Credit," S. Gorbunov and N. Shmelev state that the sharp rise of international indebtedness and the aggravation of the liquidity problem are the repercussions of controversial shifts in the structure of the world capitalist economy. The trends observed reflect the gradual transformation of national capital into an integral part of the new economic phenomenon -- international financial capital. This process now embraces not only the main imperialist centers but also an increasing number of developing countries. The authors analyze the integration of international and national financial markets, proving their conclusions by numerous facts and substantial statistical data. They assess the causes and implications of the contemporary indebtedness crisis and its impact on the world capitalist economy. The crucial changes within the international financial system have affected the quantitative aspects of financial resources migration as well as the structure and concrete forms of the international movements of capital. In this connection, the authors investigate the new role of private banks, the alteration of their policy, and the internationalization of banking. The paper concludes with some general comments on state regulation of the credit system and monetary problems on national and international levels.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

12424
CSO: 1816/8

USSR 'STRUGGLE FOR PEACE' CONTRASTED WITH U.S. POLICY

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDURNARODNIYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 11, Nov 84 pp 3-14

[Article by Yu. Mel'nikov: "Peaceful Coexistence and the Struggle for the Right to Live"]

[Text]

I

The further the date of 7 November (25 October) 1917 recedes into the past, the more clearly and broadly we see the significance of the revolution in Russia which was accomplished on that day under the leadership of the party of Bolsheviks, the formation of the first socialist state in the world, and its role in all the future history of mankind.

When the great founder and leader of the Communist Party and the Soviet State, V.I. Lenin, was explaining to American workers the meaning of what was happening in far-away Russia, he especially singled out the basic international aspect of the October Revolution: "We have broken the iron rings of imperialist ties, dirty imperialist treaties, and imperialist chains," he wrote. "We, as a socialist republic, although a tormented one plundered by the imperialists, have remained outside the imperialist war and raised the banner of peace, the banner of socialism, before the entire world.

"It is not surprising that the gang of international imperialists hate us for this. The first country to break the convict's chain of imperialist war was our country."

The republic of the Soviets, by taking the decisive step of withdrawing from the world war which cost mankind tens of millions of killed, wounded, and crippled and stopping this slaughter, took upon itself the great and humane historical mission of the struggle for universal peace, so that the competition which was developing on an international scale between socialism and capitalism would follow a peaceful path. Appealing to the working masses and the realistically thinking and pacifistically inclined circles of the dominant classes, it countered its ideals of peace and rejection of conquest and oppression of the weak by the strong to the imperialist policy of violence, wars, and annexations. In this way it broke decisively with the old imperialist system of international relations and spoke out for their

reorganization on peaceful and democratic foundations and for confirmation of the principle of peaceful coexistence in relations between socialist and capitalist states as the only alternative to increasingly destructive and deadly wars.

The first foreign policy enactment of Soviet Russia was the Decree on Peace addressed to all warring governments and peoples. Forced to fight for its very existence in the grave conditions of civil war and foreign intervention, ruin, and starvation, the Republic of the Soviets, as V.I. Lenin emphasized, strove to take any opportunity to achieve peace, and began the peaceful building of socialism. "We have proven our ability," he wrote in regard to the treaty bringing an end to the war with bourgeois Estonia, "to promptly and in good faith renounce force in order to move on to a policy of peace."²

When V.I. Lenin exposed the false accusations of bourgeois politicians and their ideological yes-men against Soviet power in regard to its supposed "undemocratic nature," "devotion to terror," and so forth, he explained that the "most important manifestation of democracy is in the basic issue of war and peace,"³ and that it is precisely the socialist republic which not only proclaims, for the first time in history, the inalienable right of man to live but also joins battle against world imperialism for this right, despite difficulties and hardships. "We represent the interests of peace with respect to most of the population of the earth as against the military-imperialist predators," he emphasized.⁴ For the sake of stopping the bloodshed and murder, Soviet Russia made compromises with the imperialist powers, eliminating their pretexts for unleashing new conflicts. In this regard, V.I. Lenin said: "The price of the blood of our workers and soldiers is too dear for us; we will pay you, like merchants, for peace at the price of heavy tribute; we will accept this heavy tribute provided we save the lives of our workers and peasants."⁵

Lenin, the greatest humanist of mankind, placed concern for man above everything and repeatedly warned that this concern is absolutely foreign to imperialists and that for the sake of profit and privileges and to gain world supremacy, they are ready to shed a sea of blood and drown the first socialist republic in the world in it. He declared the defense of this republic and its citizens from imperialist aggression and counterrevolution the first duty of the revolutionary people and of all genuine internationalists. "We must accompany our steps toward peace with intensification of our entire military preparedness, without any question of disarming our army," appealed V.I. Lenin to the delegates of the 9th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) "Our army is a real guarantee that the imperialist powers will not make the slightest attempt or the smallest encroachments since although they could count on several ephemeral successes at first, not one of them would escape utter defeat by Soviet Russia."⁶

The principled and consistent Leninist policy of decisively rebuffing imperialist aggression and intervention and the policy of internationalism and peaceful coexistence not only brought the Soviet Republic peace and recognition but growing prestige and influence on the international arena as well. Back in the 1920's, the USSR came forward with important initiatives to develop extensive interstate economic cooperation and disarmament. In the early 1930's, it was the first to raise a warning voice in regard to the rise

of dangerous centers of war in the Far East and in Europe and fought very actively for their elimination and the creation of a European system of collective security to restrain Hitler's Germany -- the main force of the coalition of fascist aggressors which was taking shape.

The Soviet Union appealed in every possible way to the community and the governments of the Western powers to combine efforts to prevent Hitler's expansion or the unleashing of world war and to stop the aggressor's dangerous impulses in the very beginning while it still could be done at the price of minimal sacrifices. Nonetheless, hoping to ultimately direct this expansion against the Soviet Union, involve it in a one-on-one struggle against fascist Germany, and benefit from their mutual weakening, the ruling circles of Great Britain, France, and the United States persistently sabotaged all the USSR's efforts to create a timely united front of opposition to fascist aggression.

The disgraceful policy of "appeasement" of the fascist aggressors followed by the people at Munich allowed the Nazis to occupy almost all of Europe. With Hitler Germany's attack on the Soviet Union and imperialist Japan's attack on the United States, the war in fact spread to the entire globe.

Forced to recognize the failure of their own Munich policy and the USSR's leading role in the struggle against the fascist aggressors, the Western powers made a military alliance with the USSR during World War II and signed important treaties on cooperation both in wartime and in the postwar period. The United Nations, whose main task was proclaimed to be maintaining universal peace and international security, was created.

The Soviet Union took upon itself the main burden of the war, lost 20 million human lives during this war, played a decisive role in achieving the Great Victory while fulfilling all its alliance obligations, and then endeavored to establish a stable and just peace and attempted to strengthen and expand postwar cooperation among states regardless of their social systems.

Nonetheless, the influential imperialist circles of the United States which had dreamed of ending World War II with the establishment of an "American peace" and who were dissatisfied with its actual results and consequences -- the conversion of the USSR into a mighty world power and mankind's progress in the cause of national and social liberation, entered on a path to disrupt postwar cooperation with the USSR, unleashed the "cold war," and began to prepare for a new war against the Soviet Union and its allies and friends. As later became known, the first plans for nuclear attack on the Soviet Union and for using surviving Nazi battalions against it were already being developed in the year of Victory -- 1945!

The struggle of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government for universal peace and security unfolded with new force in the postwar years. Relying on its mighty defense and economic potential and the support of fraternal socialist countries, the many other countries which had been liberated, and peace-loving public opinion, the USSR numerous times thwarted the schemes of American imperialism to unleash a new world war, export counterrevolution, "liberate" the countries of the socialist community, and suppress the national-liberation struggle in different regions of the globe. Important

successes of Soviet foreign policy were the conclusion of peace treaties with former allies of Hitler's Germany, the peaceful settlement of a number of severe crises -- Berlin, the Middle East, the Caribbean, and others, the achievement of detente in Europe and in relations with the United States in the late 1960's -- early 1970's, and the calling and work of the 1975 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Helsinki and the signing of its historic Final Act. The conference finalized the essential political results of World War II, fixed the inviolability of the established borders in Europe, and opened up new opportunities to develop measures of trust between states belonging to different social systems and military alliances, to expand ties between them in the fields of economics, science, engineering, environmental protection, power engineering, and transport and in humanitarian questions, and -- most importantly -- to further consolidate peace. And these opportunities continue to exist despite the fierce counterattack waged in recent years by world imperialism, headed by the United States, against the policy of peaceful coexistence and cooperation and against the right of peoples to national independence, sovereignty, and social progress.

The USSR and its allies in the Warsaw Pact Organization, who were the instigators in calling the conference in Helsinki, consider the subsequent observance -- to an equal degree -- of the principles and all points of the Final Act fundamentally important. They are decisively against taking out of context, distorting, and using any one section of the document to upset the entire process of detente and the normalization of international relations. The Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact states adopted at the summit conference of the Political Consulting Committee, which took place in Prague 4-5 January 1983, emphasized: "By speculating on the human rights issue, reactionary imperialist circles try to screen their disregard for the fundamental rights of workers and the vital interests of peoples." The Declaration noted, "Recently they have unleashed an extensive campaign against the socialist countries and national-liberation and other progressive movements; the goal of this campaign is to justify the policy of confrontation and the arms race, serious violation of the independence of various states, interference in their internal affairs, complication of the conditions of their economic development, and resistance to the process of detente. This policy is in conflict with the legal, universally accepted rights of all people and peoples and above all -- their right to live."

II

The historical experience of the October Revolution, World War II, and the failure of imperialist aggressive wars in the postwar period confirm the justice and validity of the Soviet Union's warnings about the futility of attempts to use military force to fight against the progressive forces of the present day and the world revolutionary process. This experience also confirms the timeliness and accuracy of the Soviet Union's repeated warnings in regard to military threats which arise because of imperialist aggressors and the need to carry out decisive collective measures to prevent them. The fact that ruling circles of the Western powers ignored these warnings and that many of them refused to unite themselves with the efforts of the USSR to preserve peace many times entailed the most serious consequences for many

countries and peoples, and is now one of the main causes of the alarming situation in the world.

Along with standard allegations of the "Soviet threat," the West has recently been intensively spreading the story that supposedly only the United States is thinking about peace and is ready to conduct almost any negotiations with the USSR on disarmament, and that the Soviet Union would only have to agree to these negotiations and the international situation would be fully "stabilized." According to these versions there is supposedly no reason to worry about the fate of the world at the present time. The NATO countries headed by the United States are supposedly concerned with nothing more than strengthening their own "defense" and positions for the dialogue with the USSR, restoring the military parity "on a regional European level" which was violated by the Soviet Union, and conducting "planned modernization" of their armed forces. And as for the Soviet Union, they say, for certain "tactical" reasons and considerations it temporarily broke off negotiations on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe and strategic arms on a global level, but sooner or later will be forced to resume them after "becoming reconciled to the facts that have developed." The cynical statement of Z. Brezinski that "American-Soviet relations today are completely normal"⁷ can be called one of the most "outstanding" in this regard.

But the real military-political situation in the contemporary world has little in common with such pharisaical pronouncements which are expected to mislead world public opinion and hide the real goals and nature of the dangerous militarist course being conducted today by the imperialist powers headed by the United States. Even a close colleague of Brezinski, the director of the institute of international research of Columbia University, S. Bialler, noted that some American leaders consider the present state of affairs in relations between the United States and the USSR as "normal." "In my opinion," he writes, "they are absolutely wrong." In a world bristling with nuclear weapons, the identification of American security with a crude anticommunist crusade cannot be normal."⁸

The leaders of the Western capitalist states and theoreticians and propagandists of their foreign and military policy try to justify or minimize the significance of such serious occurrences as the unfolding of a new round of the arms race, the conduct by the Reagan administration of a line of confrontation with the Soviet Union and the imposition of this line on its partners in the bloc, and its attempts to turn NATO into a global anticommunist and antipeople "20th Century holy alliance." The well-known American observer J. Kraft acknowledges: "Having won the battle to deploy modernized nuclear weapons in Europe (but in reality a new generation of weapons -- author), Pentagon hawks are in a flurry of activity. They are demanding a space antimissile system costing billions of dollars for 'star wars'. If they are given free rein, they will leave nothing for the negotiation table which could induce the Russians to sit down at that table. The Russians have more and more reason to suppose that Mr. Reagan is throwing down a challenge to the very legality of the communist state and that he is trying to eliminate it."⁹

Following the United States, other Western powers are also building up the arms race more and more. England and France are conducting a so-called modernization of their nuclear missile weapons; the result is that the weapons' range, destructive power, accuracy, and so forth are substantially increased. French "rapid action forces" are being created and deployed according to the American example. Contrary to the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements, the process of militarization of the FRG is being intensified (its partners in the Western European Alliance have permitted it to build heavy bombers and long-range missiles) and Washington is continually supplying it with new types of weapons. But this is the country where surviving Nazis and revanchists are raising their heads and voices ever higher. The Nakasone government in Japan, which is more and more actively joining Washington's efforts to create a second, "eastern" front of the confrontation with the USSR, is increasing military expenditures and "self-defense" forces, modernizing and expanding their operating radius, more closely coordinating its military efforts and measures with American and NATO ones, making claims for its so-called "northern territories," and kindling an anti-Soviet, chauvinist mood in the country.

In the capitalist world, the "war party" is acquiring more and more influence; this party, as V.I. Lenin noted, "says to itself: force must be used immediately with no regard for future consequences."¹⁰

Reliance on force, the saturation of its allies and clients with weapons, interference in the affairs of other countries, and state terrorism -- and all this under the false pretext of the "struggle against the Soviet threat" -- is also characteristic of the Reagan government policy in many "peripheral zones" of the world -- from Central America to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. This leads to the aggravation of old and the emergence of new "local" crises, each of which could develop into a large-scale conflict. Rejecting all proposals by the Soviet Union, other socialist, and many non-aligned states on political normalization of crucial international problems, Washington is itself trying to solve these problems in the interests of general imperialism, from positions of force and anticommunism, and is demanding the same of its NATO allies. And this in turn leads to a further increase in international tension, the threat of war, and the danger of thermonuclear catastrophe.

The Declaration "Maintenance of Peace and International Economic Cooperation" adopted at the summit conference of CEMA countries in Moscow in June 1984 emphasizes: "The leaders of communist and worker parties and heads of state and governments of the CEMA countries proceed from the fact that the political and economic situation in the world affects the interests of all countries and peoples as never before, and express deep anxiety over the fact that the threat to the world has intensified. International tension has seriously increased as a result of the confrontation course being conducted by the aggressive circles of imperialism, above all American ones, and their attempts to achieve military superiority and conduct a policy of force, interference in internal affairs, strangulation of national independence and state sovereignty, and consolidation and redistribution of 'spheres of influence.' Old centers of tension are blazing up and new conflicts and crises are being provoked in different parts of the globe.

"The escalation of the arms race by these circles is one of the main causes of the intensification of political and economic instability in the world and increases the danger of nuclear war, threatens the very existence of mankind, and places an increasingly heavy burden on the peoples of the world by diverting enormous material and financial resources and inhibiting economic and social progress."

Under cover of lulling pronouncements on peace and appeals to discuss the "question of negotiations," the United States and NATO are conducting an increasingly irresponsible policy of arms race, interventions, and war. Washington is trying to change the existing rough military-strategic parity with the USSR to its favor, creating more and more new bases and staging areas for the "periphery" of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, developing the latest weapons systems to deliver a "preventive," that is, first strike against these countries, advocating a doctrine of "limited" and general nuclear war, and appealing for a "crusade" against world socialism. It was precisely President Reagan, in the evaluation of one of the well-known American historians, H. Commager, who gave the "worst presidential speech in American history," the essence of which amounted to the old slogan of American "mad dogs" -- "better dead than red" -- when he viciously attacked the "aggressive impulses of the evil empire."¹¹

Needless to say, it is hard to expect the American imperialists or the politicians, ideologists, and propagandists who are dependent on them to give an objective interpretation and evaluation of the facts of the increasing militarization of the United States which leads to greater international tension and danger of war. Either they deny this greater danger or they try to lay blame for it on the Soviet Union, world socialism, or the national-liberation struggle of peoples. Again and again they repeat the myths of the "Soviet threat to the West," the "unjustified growth of the military power of the USSR," and its supposed departure from the principles of peaceful coexistence or attempts to use them for its own unilateral advantage to "lull the vigilance of the West; these myths have been repeatedly disproved by the very course of events."

Here, as they say, they are "breaking through an open door." The USSR has never deviated from the basic Leninist principles of its foreign policy -- proletarian, socialist internationalism and peaceful coexistence -- and has invariably tried and is trying to realize these principles as applied to the given actual-historical situation, the existing ratio of forces, and the trends of world development. In light of this, insuring the most favorable conditions for the building of socialism, the peace and security of all peoples, and the first and inalienable right of all people -- the right to live -- was, is, and will be the main goal of Soviet policy.

And at the present time the Soviet Union continues the fight to establish the principles of peaceful coexistence as the foundation of relations between socialist and capitalist states, including the leading Western powers. It is precisely because of the firmness and at the same time persistence of the Soviet people and the Soviet Government and their devotion to the cause of peace and international cooperation, that it has been and will be possible in a number of cases to prevent further sharp aggravations of the world situation

and certain local situations, extinguish certain crises and conflicts, maintain political dialogue on a number of problems, as well as economic, scientific-technical, cultural, and other ties with most Western powers, and convene the Stockholm conference on measures of trust, security, and disarmament in Europe.

III

The principled and unwavering position of the Soviet Union on the basic international issues was once again clearly laid out during meetings of leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet State with leading statesmen of capitalist countries who visited our country in 1984. Taking advantage of all opportunities to normalize and expand relations with capitalist states, the Soviet Union conducted and is conducting active negotiations with many of them on a broad range of issues of bilateral relations and general world problems.

In April-May 1984, the king of Spain, Juan Carlos, and the ministers of internal affairs of the FRG -- H.-D. Genscher, Italy -- G. Andreotti, and Australia -- W.J. Hayden visited the USSR. In June the Soviet Union was visited by French President F. Mitterand and G. Howe, British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs. Although the visits revealed different approaches to a number of questions, on the whole they promoted better understanding of each other's positions and further development of political dialogue and cooperation in certain fields of economics, science, and culture. However, in USSR relations with the United States not only is a lack of progress observed but actual regression on the main problem of contemporary times -- stopping the arms race, limiting arms, disarming, and reducing the danger of war; this is the fault of the United States. In his 21 May 1984 speech A.A. Gromyko noted: "Today, in Western Europe you sometimes hear it said that relations between the East and the West must not be reduced to the question of missiles. But to talk that way is equivalent to saying: everything must not be reduced to the question of war and peace, there are other questions as well. There is very little logic in such reasoning."¹²

Realistically thinking circles in the West are aware of the danger in continuing the arms race and the policy of confrontation with the USSR and the futility of attempts to impose on it, using force and threats, unequal "rules of conduct" which in essence demand that the Soviet Union refuse to fulfill its international duty and are incompatible with the status of a great power. The sense of self-preservation impels them, like the broad popular masses of capitalist states, to favor normalization of the international situation, the nuclear weapons freeze and disarmament, political dialogue with the Soviet Union, and the development of economic, cultural, and other ties with it.

Nonetheless, the governments now in power in a number of Western powers are not only essentially ignoring the reality of the situation but the opinion and position of most of their own people. It is difficult and simply impossible to believe the sincerity of statements of statesmen of the FRG, Great Britain, and Italy on their desire to secure peace and trust in relations between the West and the East when Pershing-2 and Tomahawk medium-range nuclear missiles, which are first strike and "limited" nuclear war weapons, are being deployed on these countries' territories. And the reason not only lies in the fact

that these states have in fact been turned into the primary staging areas for conducting this strike and nuclear war against the Soviet Union and the European socialist states, but that the West German, English, and Italian governments are ceasing to be masters of their own countries, fates, and words. Washington has repeatedly demonstrated that alliance obligations and consultation are a way for it to impose its decisions and will.

The increasing pressure of the United States on the countries of Western Europe is revealed more and more clearly and often not only in military-political spheres but in economic, scientific-technical, technological, administrative, ideological, cultural, and other spheres as well. This is explained by both subjective factors -- the unusual assertiveness of the Reagan administration and the tendency of present Western European governments to give in to it -- and objective circumstances, above all the process of strengthening economic and political potential and the relative independence of Western European countries. Especially revealing is the counterattack of American imperialism on the economic and political positions of those Western European states which slightly increased their independence from Washington in the detente years.

Unintentionally revealing the falsity and hypocrisy of their claims to the role of "defenders of democracy," President Reagan and his circle have repeatedly ignored the clearly expressed mood of most Western Europeans, Americans, and other peoples of the world in favor of the nuclear arms freeze and negotiations and agreements with the USSR on limiting arms. They even disregard the demands being heard in Congress to reduce, at least a little, the colossal level of military spending and programs for an unrestrained U.S. arms buildup.

Characterizing the methods the White House has resorted to in order to mislead public opinion, the NEW YORK TIMES noted in an editorial that the present administration "has a strange way of extending the olive branch." "The President," wrote the newspaper, "recently invited Moscow to join with him in new efforts to control nuclear weapons. But he then allowed the U.S. Air Force to advertise their contradictory interests by experimenting with antisatellite missiles and permitted officials to poison the atmosphere by accusing the Russians of violating agreements in the arms field. These Air Force experiments threaten to set off a new round of arms development which, to the great detriment of America itself, will make all satellites vulnerable." The newspaper recalled that in August of the past year (1983 -- author) the USSR had made a proposal for a treaty banning antisatellite weapons and noted: the Reagan administration "refused to even talk about it" although such a treaty "would serve the interests of stability on the whole and American interests in particular."

The operation of a centripetal trend has been noted recently in the capitalist world; this trend reflects a relative consolidation of its "unity" on the basis of increased ties of military-industrial complexes and traditional corporations, anticommunism, and submission to American dominance. This has not removed the sharp interimperialist contradictions which exist, nor improved the situation of world imperialism on the whole; nor has it led to any changes in the ratio of forces to its benefit. But on the other hand, it

has activated a militaristic-conservative line in the politics of a number of important capitalist powers and strained their relations with the USSR and the entire international situation.

Under pressure of the military-industrial complexes of the Western powers, the process of militarization is being developed and intensified both in domestic and foreign policy and the proportion of arms production in their economies, of arms trade in foreign trade turnover, and of military-strategic issues on the agendas of their conferences is increasing. A graphic example of this is the recent summit conferences of the "Big Seven" of the capitalist world, which were long ago converted from meetings to discuss and resolve economic problems into forums for warlike declarations on the "unity" and "resolution" of these countries in the struggle against the "Soviet threat," "international terrorism," and so forth. In his answers to the newspaper PRAVDA concerning the London conference of the "seven," K.U. Chernenko noted: "The recent meeting of the 'seven' was supposedly called to review economic problems. But it dealt primarily with politics. Once again, as at the May NATO session, many speeches were made declaring peaceful intentions and interest in reducing the arms level, including nuclear arms. Once again appeals were heard to the Soviet Union to conduct dialogue and negotiations. But unfortunately, these intentions and these appeals were not backed by anything real. There was as much talk about dialogue and negotiations as was needed as a screen to somehow cover converting the territory of a number of Western European countries into launching areas for new American missiles. Economic problems would be resolved 100 times more easily if there were no arms race -- it is a voracious machine which consumes inestimable intellectual and material resources. But this is precisely the central issue which the conference of the 'seven' ignored."¹⁵

Not only does the militaristic course of American imperialism create an increasingly more serious threat to the main human right, the right to live, but every day and everywhere flagrantly infringes on and violates this right. Every year the number of victims is increasing in so-called local conflicts provoked and fanned by American imperialists in the Near East and in the Persian Gulf, in Central America, and in South Africa where allies, satellites, and hirelings of the United States with its help and sometimes its direct participation try to crush the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress. For a long period of time, hundreds and thousands of people, including Americans themselves, have suffered and died from radiation sickness resulting from atomic bombardment and experiments and the production and use of chemical weapons and other means of mass annihilation from the military arsenal of the United States.

By conducting a course of military confrontation instead of negotiations, and undermining interstate cooperation to solve such urgent global problems as combating the disturbance of the ecological balance, environmental pollution, epidemics, and starvation in a number of developing countries, American imperialism takes additional responsibility for the rise in illness and mortality among the population of the globe caused by malnutrition, poisoning, and the like. And all this is accompanied by a general decline in the standard of living resulting from diverting an increasingly greater share of national income and expenditures to arms and maintaining armed forces.

No restraining moral-political factors really exist for the Reagan government. Moreover, it clearly suffers from a lack of understanding of the main realities of the age. "All references to contemporary weapons," writes the well-known American academic and public figure J.K. Galbraith, "have an additional subtext of the destruction not only of the enemy but of peaceful citizens and to an increasingly greater degree all life on earth as well. But not one of these genuinely formidable factors, it seems, influences the thinking and announcements of the administration (of Reagan -- author). Instead, an unconditional obligation has been adopted to build new types of weapons and arms systems and deploy those of them which are now becoming available. And all this has well publicized priority over the tasks of effective arms control. In recent years we have heard a stream of announcements from high-level civilian leaders on the possibility and acceptability of limited nuclear war, the possibility of prolonged nuclear conflict, and victory in nuclear war, as well as proposals or plans to create systems to defend the population which lead more and more closely and clearly to insanity."¹⁴

The Soviet Union cannot and will not remain indifferent to the attempts of American imperialism to change the existing strategic parity to its favor and conduct economic, technological, "psychological," and other wars against it and against its allies and friends. Nor can the Soviet Union ignore the aspirations of the Reagan administration to "isolate" the USSR, shove it aside from participating in solving disputed international problems, create centers of conflict and tension along its borders, organize sabotage-subversive activities against socialist countries and progressive regimes, and export counterrevolution.

"Aspirants to world supremacy have also been known in history in the past," emphasized K.U. Chernenko. "But for the first time aspirations of this kind rely on a nuclear-missile and space material base. For the first time these aspirations are a threat not only to the freedom of peoples but to their very existence."¹⁵

Concerned not only for the security and interests of its own country but also for those of its allies and friends and all peace-loving and progressive forces, the Soviet Union has been forced to be especially vigilant in relations with the United States and some of its closest partners at the present time. The major goal of its policies is not only to maintain the military parity between the USSR and the United States which has developed, but to prevent any aggressive, adventurist actions on Washington's part which could have extremely serious consequences for universal peace and human civilization.

Persistently focusing the attention of all governments and peoples on the increasing threat of war caused by American and world imperialism, the Soviet Union consistently fights to realize a whole complex of measures of trust, rules of international conduct, and agreements on disarmament which would help improve and develop relations between it and the leading capitalist states, among them the United States. Norms of mutual relations of powers with nuclear weapons proposed by the Soviet Union occupy an especially important

place among these measures. The adoption of these norms by all nuclear states would lead to a fundamental improvement in relations between the USSR and the United States and the East and the West, and the entire international situation as a whole since, taken together, they would be a decisive step in the direction of eliminating the danger of thermonuclear war -- the main threat which hangs over mankind today.

The Soviet Union has come forward with yet another major initiative -- the conduct of urgent bilateral negotiations with the United States to stop the militarization of space in order to reliably cut off any way of expanding the arms race into space, prohibit all offensive weapons in space, and introduce a moratorium on experiments and the development of antimissile, antisatellite, and all other similar means at the very moment these negotiations begin. The successful conduct of these negotiations would eliminate the emerging prospect of converting space into a staging area for "star wars" and "strikes from the sky" against the Earth.

Normalization of relations between the USSR and capitalist powers would promote real progress in the matter of arms limitation and disarmament, the adoption of agreed-upon measures of trust, and the rejection by the United States and NATO of attempts to conduct affairs with the USSR and other socialist countries "from a position of strength." The elimination of the threat of war and the general normalization of the international situation would confirm recognition of the principles of peaceful coexistence as the only realistic basis for relations between socialist and capitalist states. In attempting to achieve this, the USSR consistently demonstrates a readiness to carry on a business-like dialogue on any vitally important question on an equal basis.

For the Soviet Union peaceful coexistence has never been reduced merely to preventing war. The Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence was always based on the possibility and need for the most extensive development of ties and cooperation between socialist and capitalist states in all fields -- economics, science and engineering, and culture. These ties and cooperation are expected to give peaceful coexistence practical, positive content and to consolidate and develop it on a comprehensive basis, as well as to promote the material and spiritual progress of mankind, improve the quality of life on Earth, and guarantee the basic human rights.

Realistically evaluating the potential and role of the highly developed capitalist powers in the contemporary world, the Soviet Union believes that a solution in the interests of all mankind of not only the main question -- war and peace, but of such important problems as rational international division of labor, the scope and progress of the scientific-technical revolution, the internationalization of communications, research and development of space and the Pacific Ocean, the ecological, energy, and food struggle and the fight against epidemics and illness, and the like depend very greatly on how relations with particular capitalist powers develop. It is precisely for this reason, it has been noted at CPSU congresses, that the development of relations of long-term mutually advantageous cooperation in various fields -- politics, economics, science, and culture -- with the United States of America, France, the FRG, Great Britain, Italy, and Canada as well as Japan

and other capitalist states appears as one of the constant tasks of Soviet foreign policy if, of course, these states, on their part, demonstrate similar readiness for such cooperation in conditions of equality, mutual benefit, respect for sovereignty and noninterference in each other's internal affairs, and without harm to the interests and rights of other countries and peoples.

The policy of the Reagan administration and a number of its NATO allies on the fundamental issues of war and peace, peaceful coexistence of states with different systems, and relations with the USSR are encountering increasing condemnation by peace-loving, progressive forces. The pressure of public opinion, imperatives of economic development, and fear of the suicidal consequences of thermonuclear war impels many leaders of capitalist states to speak out in favor of dialogue and negotiations and for reducing the level of military confrontation between the East and the West.

Washington, K.U. Chernenko emphasizes, is "simply losing its sense of reality" in an obsession with force. "The world has changed radically. Force does not solve its problems. This has already been proven repeatedly, including by the experience of the United States of America itself. One cannot consolidate one's own security at the expense of the security of others. Plans to achieve military superiority in the hope of gaining the upper hand in nuclear war are also not feasible today. The Soviet Union itself does not aspire to military superiority over others, but neither does it allow superiority over itself. It is possible that it is difficult for some people in the United States to accustom themselves to this, but they must recognize the fact that our two states can only conduct affairs on an equal basis, with due regard for each other's legal interests. There is no reasonable alternative to it."¹⁶

The USSR again confirmed its readiness for serious business-like dialogue during the recent meetings of A.A. Gromyko with the President of the United States and other American representatives. But what came out of the conversations which took place? "It must be stated," it was noted at the meeting of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, "that the broad exchange of opinions which was conducted on the key issues of Soviet-American relations and in this connection on the state of affairs in the world did not reveal signs which would have confirmed a real intention on the American side to adapt the course of its policies to the direction of realism and love of peace. The general announcements in favor of more constructive relations with the USSR which the American side made are not backed by concrete actions."^{17??}

Both historical experience and the reality of the contemporary world confirm again and again that improving and developing multilateral relations between the USSR and capitalist states can and must be approached on the basis of the proven Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence -- equality and mutual benefit, equal security, noninterference in internal affairs of other countries, the inviolability of borders and territorial integrity, respect for sovereignty, and rejection of the use of force or the threat of it. As the Declaration of the USSR Council of Ministers on forthcoming activity, made at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, stated, the Soviet Government will continue to rigorously follow the policy of guaranteeing the security of our state and its allies, take the necessary steps to bring about a change in the international situation for the better, and implement a policy aimed at

delivering mankind from the nuclear threat, securing peace, and developing equal cooperation among all countries.^{18T}

As a great and powerful world power, the Soviet Union realizes the enormous responsibility which it has for the fate of the world and mankind. And it has firmly resolved, along with the fraternal socialist countries and progressive, peace-loving forces, to do everything necessary to insure that the policy of peaceful coexistence triumphs over the aggressive militaristic course of imperialism, to achieve a universal, just, and stable peace, and to guarantee all the people of our planet the main human right -- the right to live.

FOOTNOTES

1. V.I.Lenin, "Polnoyesobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Works], Vol 137, pp 53-54, 64.
2. Ibid., Vol 40, p 91.
3. Ibid., Vol 40, p 92.
4. Ibid., Vol 40, p 96.
5. Ibid., Vol 39, p 403.
6. Ibid. Vol 40, p 248.
7. TIME, 2 January 1984, p 21.
8. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 11-12 February 1984.
9. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 19 December 1983.
10. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 36, p 333.
11. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 18 January 1984.
12. PRAVDA, 22 May 1984.
13. PRAVDA, 14 June 1984.
14. INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, 7 February 1984.
15. PRAVDA, 29 April 1984.
16. PRAVDA, 2 September 1984
17. PRAVDA, 5 October 1984.
18. See PRAVDA, 13 April 1984.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

12424

CSO: 1816/8

U.S.-WEST EUROPEAN DIFFERENCES ON MILITARY POLICY HIGHLIGHTED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 11,
Nov. 84 pp 15-24

[Article by G. Vorontsov: "The United States, NATO, and Euromissiles"]

[Text] Having set itself the illusory goal of world domination, Washington persistently strives to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and other socialist states. Military expenditures are being increased at an unprecedented rate and large-scale programs to produce new and new types of weapons are being carried out at an accelerated rate. The growing threat presented by the United States and NATO is clearly demonstrated by the development of their first-strike potential against the USSR and its allies and the deployment of the new American nuclear missiles in the territories of Western European states, that is, in the immediate proximity of countries of the socialist community. This systematically implemented U.S. action represents an important basis of the strategy of direct confrontation adopted by the R. Reagan administration. Raising the level of danger in Europe, this action is organically incorporated into the "crusade" against socialism.

I

The development of events on the European continent has taken an especially alarming turn as a result of the militarist actions of the United States and NATO as a whole. It can be asserted with full justification that Europe has entered a very important period of its existence.

The first and most important element in this connection is the noticeably increased nuclear danger for the European peoples. As a matter of fact, the deployment of new American first-strike nuclear weapons represents a fundamentally new aspect of the development of the situation on the continent. According to Admiral A. Sanguinetti, former commander of the French Mediterranean fleet, "U.S. Eurostrategic weapons represent a real threat hanging over the European nations."¹

In order to restore the military balance, the USSR has been forced to take countermeasures. Thus, as a result of the aggressive policy of the United States, the level of military opposition between the USSR and the United

States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO is rising and approaching the line that divides peace from war.

At the same time, the negotiation process, based on solving disputes by peaceful means, respect for and consideration of mutual interests, and the principles of parity and equal security, has been essentially undermined. Let us recall that the White House has unilaterally broken off negotiations on stopping nuclear experiments completely, on limiting military activities in the Indian Ocean, on antisatellite systems, and on other points. By starting to deploy missiles, Washington has also made the Geneva negotiations on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe pointless.

It is no secret to anyone that for nearly two years the U.S. delegation did nothing but waste time. Its main function was to erect a diplomatic screen for the preparations to deploy American missiles which were in full swing at the time. P. Nitze, chief of the American delegation, quite openly revealed the U.S. position in an interview with the LOS ANGELES TIMES back in 1981. "Serious negotiations on arms control can only take place after we have increased our forces," he said. In response to the question as to when this might happen, P. Nitze spoke about a "10-year period of time."² Judging by everything, the delegation he headed was guided by precisely this approach.

Recently, quite a few declarations have been heard in the U.S. halls of power asserting that Washington is ready to return to the negotiation table, that it aspires to achieve a "just agreement," and so forth. However, these demagogic statements have not been corroborated by any real actions at all. The deployment of missiles continues according to schedule. The Pentagon has been allotted a fabulous amount of funds for 1985, in excess of 300 billion dollars, and the plan is to increase these expenditures to 465 billion dollars by the end of the 1980's.

The installation of new American missiles in Europe is not the only step in U.S. and NATO militarist activities. It is the beginning of a new massive round in the arms race which also includes the deployment of neutron and chemical weapons in West European countries and the accelerated buildup of conventional weapons. The recent sessions of NATO organs are convincing proof of this.

In an interview for the 7 January 1984 Sunday supplement of LE FIGARO, R. Reagan considered it necessary to note the "enormous importance" of modernizing the NATO conventional armed forces. The President pointed out that this modernization is already being carried out at an accelerated rate and declared: "However, America is not in a position to fulfill this task alone, and it is very important to insure that its NATO partners do everything in their power to raise the fighting effectiveness of their own armed forces."

It is clear that Washington is orienting NATO toward a large-scale arms race that is politically extremely dangerous and represents a heavy economic burden. The program of supplying Western Europe with a new generation of American weapons with greater firepower, accuracy, and range is of primary importance. Within the framework of this program, 30 of the most modern and extraordinarily expensive weapons systems equipped with microcomputers,

microcircuits, electronic reconnaissance instruments, and the like are being thrust on the allies.

The United States hopes to succeed in this sphere too because it has managed to tie its main partners, the FRG, Great Britain, and Italy, even more securely to its war chariot through the deployment of the new missiles. Judging by all available evidence, the R. Reagan administration believes that since they yielded in one case, they will continue to yield even further -- it is only necessary to increase the pressure. It is not without reason that threats to "punish" the Europeans in the event of insubordination have been resounding from Washington recently. Thus, at one of his press conferences, L. Eagleburger, then deputy secretary of state, directly expressed his displeasure with their "disobedience" and even threatened that the United States could "change the emphasis" of its policy in regard to Western Europe.

Indignation over the actions of those who are sacrificing the security of Western Europe to Washington's imperial ambitions is growing in response to the activization of the imperialist policy of whipping up tension in Europe. Millions of people are participating in the antiwar and antimissile movement. It must be said that the United States and the NATO leadership have clearly underrated the extent of the opposition to nuclear plans. The deployment of the new American missiles has by no means put an end to mass protest campaigns. Various social groups and strata of the population, regardless of their political convictions, party affiliation, or religion, are uniting in the struggle to preserve the fundamental human right -- the right to live.

Noticeable changes in the deployment of forces are being observed in this connection. For the first time in postwar years, most Western European social-democratic parties oppose the Pentagon's nuclear plans. Let us consider the FRG, for example. Whereas previously its main political parties held identical or similar positions on European security issues, the situation has now changed. Thus, the largest opposition force in the FRG, the Social Democratic Party of Germany, refused to share responsibility with the ruling coalition for the installation of American missiles. This turn of events is even more symbolic in view of the fact that at one time some of its leaders were -- as it was commonly believed in the West -- the initiators of NATO's "two-track decision."

The polarization of political forces in the West is obvious. The conservative right wing of the international bourgeoisie headed by the U.S. administration is becoming more clearly discernible and its main goal is, within the framework of the "crusade," to erect a new "cordon sanitaire" around the USSR and other countries of the socialist community. However, most of the people oppose the alliance of the military-industrial complexes, reactionaries, and conservatives. An unprecedentedly broad spectrum of social strata and movements are participating in the antiwar and antimissile struggle. Among them are social democrats, church figures, trade unions, communists, and some representatives of military circles.

Confronted with the growth of a mass antimissile movement, NATO leaders have been forced to resort to maneuvering and to cover up their militarist course with peace-loving phrases. In analyzing the current situation, the prominent

publicists and public figures D. and C. Roberts write in their recently published book entitled "Europe -- First Continent of Lasting Peace": "Either the Western European governments will take into account the wishes of their voters or they will disregard them. If they do the latter, they will -- in the final analysis -- entrust their national sovereignty to the United States and greatly increase the danger of nuclear war in Europe."³

Despite all the efforts of conservative right wing circles, in Europe the United States is seen more and more not as a protector against the mythical "threat from the East," but as a direct source of military danger and a force striving to subordinate Western Europe to itself politically, crush its economy, and force it to pay for U.S. militarist preparations and aggressive plans. And however much Washington may try to disguise itself in the cloak of "protector," its real plans and hopes are no secret to the West Europeans. In his speech in Parliament, the prominent English political figure D. Healey said: "The only reason for the deployment of these (American -- G.V.) missiles in Europe is to allow the Americans to strike without becoming involved in a nuclear war themselves and to save the United States."⁴ In other words, Washington is prepared to sacrifice its allies in order to achieve its own egotistical goals.

Nonetheless, U.S. hopes will be left by the wayside; they are unrealizable. The Soviet Union has declared with complete resolution and determination that the United States will sense the difference between the situation which has existed until now and the future, after additional Soviet weapons have been deployed on the oceans and seas near its territory, weapons which by their flight time and performance are similar to the weapons the United States is now deploying near the Soviet Union's territory. No U.S. challenge will be left unanswered. And the time has come to ask: should such a challenge be issued when the action will inevitably result in a counteraction necessary to restore equilibrium? Would it not be better to break this vicious circle, stop the new round of the arms race, and return to the situation that existed before the new missiles were deployed? The urgent need to do this is especially obvious in the present tense situation. As a staunch adherent of solving urgent international problems through negotiations, the USSR consistently advocates an honest, equitable, and serious dialogue.

The Stockholm conference could accomplish a lot in this sphere. Unlike the U.S. position aimed at diverting the conference's work from adopting measures to prevent war, the constructive line followed by the USSR and its allies, who have revealed the true sources of the danger of war and made realistic and effective proposals to eliminate them, has evoked a great response. These proposals have been received with understanding among the neutral and nonaligned states, and some NATO countries have also shown interest in them. For example, no one at the conference ventured to oppose the proposal of the socialist states to conclude a Treaty on Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and Maintenance of Peaceful Relations between the Warsaw Pact member-states and NATO member-states.

As far as Europe is concerned, the Soviet position is absolutely clear. We are in favor of making Europe free from nuclear weapons -- both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. We are in favor of both sides making the first

important step in this direction without losing any time. In light of this, the Soviet Union has no intention of strengthening its security at the expense of others, but wants equal security for all.

II

It is symptomatic that at the very time when, in the opinion of Washington and NATO leaders, "Atlantic unity" on the basic issues of strategy and policy is particularly necessary, these issues have become the subject of sharp debate. "The current controversies in NATO are alarming and at the same time unprecedented," H. Kissinger notes with concern.⁵ "Never before in the course of 30 years has the public so actively raised the question of the reasons for NATO's existence and demanded explanations of some of its actions," British Air Marshal Lord Cameron seconds him.⁶

This turn of affairs is related both to world affairs and internal Atlantic affairs. First and foremost, despite all their efforts, the United States and NATO have not managed to achieve superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, whom they could not -- and naturally will not in the future -- intimidate by installing new American missiles in Europe, and dispose them to unilateral concessions. The countermeasures taken by the USSR and its allies to restore equilibrium have clearly indicated the futility of all attempts to gain one-sided military advantages for NATO. At the same time, the increased level of the nuclear missile stand-off provoked by the U.S. and NATO actions has again demonstrated the adventurism of their militaristic plans that are bringing Europe to the brink of danger.

Furthermore, the NATO states headed by the United States have also failed to win the anticipated political dividends. The peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the constructive course of the Warsaw Pact countries have again proven their vital force, and their international authority has increased even further. Once again it has been demonstrated that Washington's aggressive policy and the very existence of NATO contradict the cause of peace, the basic direction of mankind's development, and its progress in all spheres of activity.

It was no less significant that the system of domination and subordination within the block has come into conflict with the new ratio of forces between the United States and Western Europe and with the essence of the partnership and rivalry between the two centers of imperialism. The Western European center has not only advanced economically to a level equal to that of the United States, but has even overtaken it in certain spheres. On several occasions in recent years the Western European states have displayed their own specific approach to various problems of international development. The range of tactical differences in achieving general imperialist goals has increased. In the conduct of their policy toward the socialist states as well as toward the developing countries, the Western European countries have begun to show an increasing independence, something which has strengthened their political and diplomatic position.

It is now possible to speak of a certain erosion of American hegemony within the "Atlantic system," especially in the economic sphere, and partially in the

political sphere as well. Even under conditions of U.S. military dominance, the redistribution of forces in the imperialist camp demands substantial adjustment in mutual relations within the North Atlantic alliance. Here we are dealing with such key issues as the elaboration of general strategy, solutions for questions related to nuclear and conventional weapons, policy in regard to the socialist states, and the like.

Thus, there is a crisis in the NATO system which, despite the reassuring statements made by the bloc's official leaders, is corroding it with new force. This crisis is reflected in numerous speeches, articles, and interviews of a number of official and unofficial figures. The journal *NEWSWEEK* draws the direct conclusion that the North Atlantic alliance does not meet the "demands of the 1980's and 1990's," noting that "such different figures as Henry Kissinger and the German 'Greens,' Helmut Schmidt, and Francois Mitterrand are inclined to this opinion. They want to change the structure of the alliance in order to save it. Others would prefer to dissolve NATO altogether and start over again. But all critics share the opinion that the balance in the comparative power of the United States and its allies within the alliance has been disrupted, something which is not beneficial to either side."

Moreover, statements about the need to reform the bloc have become a kind of fad in the West, and even some representatives of rightwing circles and highly placed military officials who not only support the NATO bloc but also serve as its supporters in their own countries show -- at least in their words -- an inclination toward this fashion to some extent. In light of this, they are forced to take account of the intensification of the antiwar movement. Thus, according to this very same Kissinger, the alliance suffers especially from the "discrepancy" between the official NATO strategy on the one hand, and what the people are prepared to support, on the other."⁸ And the ideas which the "people are prepared to support" are absolutely clear. It is enough in this connection to analyze the slogans used in numerous demonstrations in various European countries: they are directed against the deployment of American missiles and against the entire militarist policy of Washington.

The reality of the crisis phenomena is being perceived with growing concern in NATO headquarters and in the capitals of the member states. The United States is especially alarmed since NATO represents an important pillar of its militarist policy. Washington is taking practical steps to impede the centrifugal forces. The main direction of these actions is confrontation. According to the American strategists' calculations, inciting war hysteria and an unrestrained arms race in all of its aspects should rally the allies around Washington. By deploying missiles in the territories of the Western European countries, the U.S. administration is trying to accomplish two tasks: create an additional threat to the Soviet Union, on the one hand; and turn its partners into nuclear hostages and bind them more securely to itself, on the other. The ambitious new programs of the conventional arms race are also aimed in this direction.

The endeavors of the United States to impede the all-European process, deepen the division of Europe, and break the traditional ties between the continent's

Western and Eastern countries or, in any event, reduce them to a minimum level also fall within the course of strategy of confrontation.

In the other "hemisphere" of the North Atlantic bloc, in Western Europe, disorder among political circles is apparent in regard to issues connected with NATO activities and with relations with the United States. Broad social forces quite definitely oppose the Pentagon's military plans and the transformation of Europe into a theater of "limited" nuclear war. The mass antiwar and antimissile movements are increasingly assuming an anti-American character. They are primarily directed against U.S. militarist policy, the aggressiveness of the present U.S. administration, and the adventurism of the partner on the other side of the ocean.

The numerically insignificant but economically and politically powerful conservative rightwing group stands at the other pole of the social spectrum. This group is represented by the military-industrial complex of the leading Western European states, the reactionary politicians, and pro-NATO military circles that have tied their fate to the arms race and the policy "from a position of strength." The aircraft, gun, tank, and missile monopolies constantly demand new military orders. The striking power of the armies of European NATO member countries has considerably increased (at present they account for 90 percent of the land forces, 75 percent of the air forces, and 80 percent of the naval forces of NATO).

These circles, like the U.S. administration, are interested in confrontation and the arms race. However, having moved closer to American imperialism, in the main and on the whole, they are demanding their "place in the sun" within the North Atlantic alliance, equal rights with the Americans in making decisions, a greater share in NATO leadership, and redistribution of military orders to their advantage. Thus, there is a certain dissatisfaction with Washington (though for different reasons, to be sure) and opposition to American domination within the bloc at this pole as well.

It is not without reason that certain questions are being raised more and more frequently in Western European political, social, and scientific circles recently; these questions deal specifically with reviewing the system of mutual relations within the alliance and its strategy, and with the need to base defense on some kind of different organization. Different versions of the formation of a military group in Western Europe, which to a considerable extent would be autonomous in relation to the United States, are being actively discussed. J.P. Pigasse, a prominent French expert and publicist, advances one of these plans in his book "The Shield of Europe: Toward Military Autonomy of the European Community." In expressing his opposition to American domination, he calls for overcoming the NATO crisis by establishing a "European defense system" based on independence in the nuclear weapons sphere, structural reorganization of the armed forces of the Western European states, and revision of the system of allied relations with the United States, going so far as to dissolve the NATO military organization.⁹

However, Pigasse's approach is one of the rather extreme versions of the solution to the problem. Views based on the continued existence of NATO which envision reforms while preserving the bloc are much more widespread.

Appraising the disputes on NATO strategy, TIME notes: "In Western Europe, for example, the Social Democrats in opposition aspire to a so-called new strategy for the alliance which would be based on greater participation of Western European allies in working out military decisions and greater reliance on conventional rather than nuclear weapons, and which would presuppose concentrated Western European diplomatic efforts to resume the dialogue with the Soviet Union. Similar views have been expressed by leaders of the socialist parties in the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, and Britain."¹⁰

With the situation which has developed, a general mood in favor of carrying out certain reforms within NATO is growing in ruling circles in the United States and the Western European countries. In recent years, many speeches have been made by prominent political, military, and public figures with proposals to revise the very concept of the alliance, upgrade the facade of the organization, increase its effectiveness, and bring it into accord with today's demands. It is characteristic that even some highly placed figures in the bloc are quite willing to consider possible alternative versions for conducting military actions in Europe. General B. Rogers, supreme commander of NATO forces in Europe, has begun to speak out on this topic very frequently. Thus, while on the whole advocating the use of nuclear weapons in Europe, he has at the same time proclaimed utilization of the "capabilities of conventional armed forces" a "more acceptable alternative."¹¹

Certain Western circles at first assessed Rogers's numerous interviews and speeches as a hint of possible changes in NATO strategy to reduce the role of nuclear weapons and bring the concept of conducting military actions with conventional armed forces and weapons to the foreground. However, as the WASHINGTON POST has noted, "The NATO command has made it clear that Rogers is not proposing any new doctrine. At the same time, his staff has been working out the tactical concept of the so-called strike against the second-echelon forces for the last 3 years."¹² Thus, the topic is modernizing NATO conventional armed forces, equipping them with the newest types of weapons, and, in the final analysis, increasing their combat capabilities.

Emphasizing his attention to the conventional arms race, Rogers does not dispute the existing NATO order and tries to bypass the sharp political corners of mutual relations within the alliance. On the contrary, he strives within the existing framework to increase the "Western Europeans' contribution" to the "common defense" which should continue to be carried out under American command.

H. Kissinger goes somewhat further, though still in the same direction, in his discussion of the full-scale plan of NATO reorganization which he presented in the pages of TIME.¹³ We will recall that the former secretary of state is the well-known "Atlantic architect." Back in 1973, on behalf of the R. Nixon administration, he proposed the so-called "New Atlantic Charter" plan, aimed at reorganizing the American-Western European partnership to conform with the new situation.

When current proposals by this prominent figure are analyzed, their similarity in many respects to the ideas of the aforementioned "charter" can be noted.

In both cases the topic is the Western Europeans acquiring "more independence in the sphere of defense" and increasing their contribution to the bloc's military expenditures. However, real equality between Western Europe and the United States is nowhere mentioned. True, it is proposed to assign the position of NATO supreme commander to a Western European general. But this "radical" step can hardly change the situation which has developed within the alliance or upset the dominant position of the United States, which would continue to be the "nuclear guarantor" of the Western European countries; its forces as well as its weapons, among them the new nuclear missiles, will remain in Europe. In essence, it is advisable for the Americans to make a number of tactical concessions and, by paying this price, not only preserve but also consolidate their position of leadership in NATO. As far as external functions are concerned, nothing new has been proposed. NATO should remain an instrument of confrontation, a tool of pressure on the USSR by force, and the initiator of new rounds in the arms race.

It seems that Kissinger's appearance in TIME, which is intended for mass readership, is by no means an accidental move but a well thought-out one. Judging from everything, he has been chosen by the circles which support him as a suitable figure to present such a plan for a number of reasons: he has the necessary authority and is widely known in Atlantic circles; he holds no official position and writes as a private person and public figure; and without making any official proposals, at the same time he is launching a trial balloon in the form of a plan that has been thought out in detail.

In summing up the essence of the proposals made by the former secretary of state, it can be concluded that the topic is preserving or even strengthening American leadership in the North Atlantic bloc. It is proposed to broaden the rights and possibilities of the allies without moving beyond the framework of NATO strategy as determined by the United States, and hence controlled by it. The social-class intent of this reform is clear: to rally NATO on the same anti-Soviet and anticommunist basis and by upgrading its appearance, to strengthen the bloc's effectiveness.

Projects of this type do not conform to the leading trends of general European development aimed at strengthening peace, security, and cooperation. The future of Europe lies on the path of disarmament, detente, arms limitation, and simultaneous disbanding of military-political alliances.

III

While reaching the "missile decision" in 1979 and starting to implement it in 1983, leaders of a number of Western European states linked their hopes to gain a NATO advantage over the Warsaw Pact with this solution. Of course, it was not just U.S. pressure that took effect here, but also class interest in insuring "effective opposition" to the countries of socialism. Hopes of strengthening the U.S. nuclear guarantees by deploying their new missiles were also important. However, it soon became clear how far from reality such hopes were: the countermeasures of the USSR aimed at neutralizing the "missile solution" clearly demonstrated the bankruptcy of a course aimed at achieving superiority. As a result, the threat of retaliation increased. As far as calculations to strengthen American nuclear guarantees are concerned, they

have also proven to be on shaky ground since U.S. military strategy has been mainly developed on the basis of the United States' own imperialist interests.

The evolution of U.S. strategic views in fact confirms that the aspiration to protect its own territory from nuclear conflict by all means possible and to channel any such conflict toward Western Europe was noticeable even back in the 1960's and 1970's. Whereas in the 1950's, American strategists proceeded from the inevitability of direct confrontation with the USSR, they later recognized the expediency of possibly shifting the main center of such a confrontation to Europe -- a little further from their own national borders.

The most noticeable changes have been revealed in connection with the deployment of new missiles. Now the stakes are clearly on "limited" nuclear war in Europe using medium-range nuclear weapons. American military experts, prominent political scientists, and sometimes figures close to the government are openly declaring or rather transparently hinting that the central weapons systems which were formerly the most important bulwark of the "strategy of deterrence" within the NATO framework, are now a kind of reserve. And since their use would subject the territory of the United States itself to a retaliatory strike, Washington is mainly counting on medium-range systems in Europe. A "limited" nuclear war "according to rules" is with no doubt an illusion. And much has been done, mainly by the Soviet side, to unmask this illusion. In this case there is something else of interest: the United States is in fact undermining what is considered one of the unshakable postulates of NATO strategy -- the "indivisibility of defense," in accordance with which an "attack" against the European allies is considered an "attack" against the United States itself. For up to now, American guarantees have been based on a readiness to use all weapons, including central weapons systems. But now a fundamental change is taking place: on the one hand, the "defense of Western Europe" appears to be standing "on its own" and its purpose is to geographically limit conflict to the boundaries of the Old World; and on the other, there is the "defense" of the United States.

The American patron is essentially deluding the European allies by officially promising to maintain guarantees, even to the point of risking a global conflict. But in fact Washington obviously does not believe it is necessary to go that far. A more convenient version involves another scheme: let the fires of war rage in Europe; during that time the Eastern European socialist countries will be drained of their blood, and the Western European allies, as Washington's hostages, will be the target of the retaliatory strike.

Washington's adventurist course in world affairs, its reliance on bare force, and its aspiration to turn back the course of history represent a serious threat to European security and to the solution of the urgent problems related to it. It is also more difficult to fulfill the accords and agreements which already exist under conditions of aggravated tension. A cause for special concern in this connection is the attempts of FRG revanchist circles, encouraged by Washington, to call existing borders into question and their aspiration to devour the GDR, create an unhealthy environment around West Berlin, and boost militarist preparations to fulfill these goals.

The Soviet Union, other socialist countries, and all peace-loving forces resolutely oppose policies aimed at undermining the foundations of the postwar order in Europe. They will not permit a repetition of the tragic past. Washington and NATO circles must realize this. And it is especially appropriate to call attention to this on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the Great Victory over the darkest and most barbaric forces of world imperialism.

It is precisely now, when questions of preserving peace and strengthening international security are particularly crucial, that it is necessary to recognize the full extent of responsibility for particular decisions and for particular policies. Efforts for peace must be made and policies which lead to undermining its foundations must be renounced -- not in words, but in deeds.

The USSR's foreign policy program and the initiatives of other socialist countries aimed at radically improving the situation in Europe and the whole world offer a reliable and realistic way out of the situation which has developed. It may be said with absolute certainty that Europe would gain considerably if all nuclear powers accepted the obligations to be guided in their relations by the norms outlined by K.U. Chernenko in his speech to voters on 2 March 1984, which above all included the obligation not to use nuclear weapons first. The aforementioned proposal to conclude a Treaty on Mutual Nonuse of Military Force and Maintenance of Peaceful Relations is also aimed at strengthening European security. The Soviet initiative regarding negotiations on not increasing and reducing military expenditures is also addressed to the NATO countries. Making Europe free of chemical weapons would also be fundamentally important. A number of other specific measures were proposed by socialist countries at the Stockholm conference, the Vienna negotiations, and the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

Much has been said recently in the West about the need for dialogue and readiness for it. However, real, positive actions are needed, and so far none are in evidence. In fact, just the opposite is observed. Take, for example, Washington's increasingly frequent assurances of its readiness for negotiations with the USSR on preventing the militarization of space. But in reality, as the practical actions of the Reagan administration show, the administration does not want to solve that problem. All its ideas are aimed at intensifying -- under cover of talks about negotiations -- the preparation and implementation of plans for space weapons and creating space strike weapons, among them antisatellite weapons.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, there is no need to convince it of the need for a Soviet-American dialogue. In his answers to PRAVDA questions published 2 September 1984, K.U. Chernenko emphasized: "We are always in favor of serious and practical negotiations. It is from this position that we approach the search for solutions to existing problems with the present U.S. administration. . . I wish to confirm with all certainty our readiness for dialogue and for honest and serious negotiations aimed at finding agreements which will take into account the interests of the security of all countries and peoples. This is our understanding of a dialogue."

FOOTNOTES

1. "General' za mir" [Generals for Peace], Moscow, 1982, p 194.
2. See LOS ANGELES TIMES, 28 September 1981.
3. D. and C. Roberts, "Europe -- First Continent of Lasting Peace", London, 1983, p 129.
4. "Parliamentary Debates. Hansard", 31 October 1983, p 638.
5. TIME, 5 March 1984, p 14.
6. "Diminishing the Nuclear Threat. NATO's Defence and New Technology", London, 1984, p 5.
7. NEWSWEEK, 9 April 1984, p 16.
8. TIME, 5 March 1984, p 14.
9. See J.P. Pigasse, "Le Bouclier d'Europe. Vers une Autonomie militaire de la Communauté" [The Shield of Europe. Toward a Military Autonomy of the Community], Paris, 1982, pp 15, 139, 226.
10. TIME, 16 January 1984, p 24.
11. See FOREIGN AFFAIRS, Summer 1982, p 1,152.
12. WASHINGTON POST, 3 November 1982.
13. See TIME, 5 March 1984, pp 14-18.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

12424

CSO: 1816/8

CEMA INTENSIFICATION, SPECIALIZATION, INTEGRATION URGED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNIYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 11,
Nov 84 pp 25-34

[Article by Yu. Belyayev: "The Production Potential of the Countries of Socialism and Some Ways to Realize It Effectively"]

[Excerpts]

III

The Announcement on Basic Directions of the Further Development and Deepening of Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation of CEMA Member-Countries emphasizes that in order to supply key sectors of production with machines and equipment of high quality and on a world technical level, "the production of both finished output and parts and assemblies as well as general machine building articles and full provision of spare parts for mutually supplied equipment" are envisioned. "In light of this, special attention will be devoted to the development of electronics, microprocessors, and robot engineering."

Changing the structure of the machine building industry of CEMA countries on the basis of faster growth in low-resource sectors and subsectors which most fully embody the demands of the law of time conservation is one of the most important ways to realize production potential effectively. The preferential development of these sectors has acquired ever increasing significance for the reorganization of the machine building industry in conditions of an acute shortage of energy and raw materials. The cost of processing primary materials rather than the cost of the primary materials themselves plays an increasingly greater role in establishing the costs of producing machine building output.

The electronics industry is developing rapidly, especially in the USSR. The technical level of the electronics industry has risen fundamentally. The construction and equipping of domestic plants with electronic-beam and optical lithography with high resolution capability measured in microns as well as laser and ion plasma equipment was a great achievement. It is characteristic of the sector that each newly built piece of equipment is several times higher in productivity and precision class than the existing one.

Microprocessors, which are complete microelectronic computers, are greatly influencing the automation process. Microprocessors -- called the catalysts

of scientific-technical progress -- are operating successfully in so-called built-in automatic control systems in machine tools with digital programmed control and in manipulators (robots) used in various production sectors. They make it possible to automate complex technological processes and planning and design and scientific research work.

On the basis of international specialization in the production of certain types of electrical engineering and electronic output, a large number of units of the unified computer series were under development or had been built by the start of the 1980's. About 50,000 scientists, designers, engineers, and technicians and approximately 300,000 workers take part in joint research and production. As a result of cooperation, the CEMA countries are able to incorporate many new types of output or modernized articles in the electronics industry every year.

In the last 5-7 years, a virtually new, promising sector of machine building has been created on the basis of means of automation in the CEMA countries -- the production of industrial robots. They are a means of comprehensive automation which fundamentally differ from traditional ones by their versatility (multifunctional capabilities) and rapid reorganization for new operations. The introduction of robots is creating the preconditions for developing fully automated adjustable lines ; production sections, and production facilities. As calculations show, the use of groups of robots increases labor productivity by a factor of 2-4, while the use of one robot is reimbursed in 1-3 years. Moreover, new fundamental opportunities are being created to increase production intensity and rhythm and output quality.

By the end of 1985, with a several-fold increase in the use of robots, more than 300 million rubles will be saved and about 100,000 workers will be liberated.¹ The production of automatic manipulators with programmed control is being developed in the CEMA countries on the basis of an agreement signed in 1980 by which the production of robots should total 200,000 units by 1990.

The metallurgy and machine building industries face especially important tasks to insure a resource conservation approach of general economic significance. The countries of the socialist community are the most important region of the world economy for producing metallurgical output (the USSR has been in first place in production volume of steel and pig iron for many years); nonetheless, there is a shortage of metal in the CEMA countries. This is primarily explained by the fact that qualitative changes in metallurgy itself are still being implemented too slowly and new technological processes are still being introduced too slowly in the main sectors that consume metal, and the metal itself is often used for other than its designated purpose. Metallurgy of the socialist countries does not produce the full range of economical shaped metals for the machine building and construction industries. The number of type-sizes of shaped rolled metals produced by industry in the CEMA countries is scarcely half their requirement for these products.

A promising direction for reducing metal consumption in the machine building industry is the use of high-strength steels. They make it possible to build fundamentally new machines of large unit capacity. In the USSR the bulk of rolled metal products from low-alloy steels (90 percent) is mainly used to

produce pipe for oil and gas mains, fittings, and ships. Only slightly more than 10 percent of the total quantity of low-alloy steels is used in machine building, and 50 percent of that goes for railroad car production.

The high level of use of cast steel and cast iron in combination with the inadequate use of rolled sheet products attests to the fact that the machine building industry does not fully introduce new technological processes for manufacturing lighter machines.

The prevalence of mechanized processing is characteristic of the present structure of semifinished articles in the machine building industry; this has predetermined large volumes of metal waste (for example, in 1980 there were 20 million tons of ferrous metal waste, including about 9 million tons of shavings). The structure of structural materials consumption underwent positive changes by weight and volume in the 1970's. There was expanded production of plastic and synthetic resin, whose proportion in the consumption of all materials rose by a factor of 1.7 by weight and a factor of 1.5 by volume and amounted to 25 percent of basic structural materials consumption.

Boosting the development of powder metallurgy is one of the most effective ways to make it possible to expand metal consumption without investing capital in the metallurgical part of the industrial complex. When metal powder is produced by contemporary methods, the consumption of liquid metal is practically equivalent to the finished product. And such traditional methods as smelting, casting, and even mechanical processing are excluded. Losses for the consumer are also minimal. Powder metallurgy also opens up new possibilities for protecting metal from corrosion. The USSR occupies leading positions in the world in a wide range of areas in the powder metallurgy field. These positions will be further strengthened in the present five-year plan, when the volume of powder metallurgy production should more than triple.

So, the loss prevention principle and material resource conservation in socialist countries are expected to play a special role in most of the planned measures for rational use and conservation of resources (including secondary ones) and in the unified plan for the comprehensive utilization of reserves for all stages of production and planning.

IV

The course of all-out intensification of social production and guarantee of an active resource conservation direction depends on achieving intra- and intersectorial balance. It goes beyond groups of similar sectors in significance and is becoming a factor in national economic proportionality. Our press has noted that difficulties in developing USSR ferrous metallurgy are related to lagging of the metallurgical machine building industry which, despite its importance, has not been singled out as an independent sector. There are still no specialized enterprises to produce metallurgical equipment. This equipment is manufactured on the side at heavy machine building plants.

In the last several years, 10-12 billion rubles have been spent to repair metallurgical equipment while capital investments in metallurgical machine building total one-twentieth of that amount. In order to replace obsolete

equipment with new equipment and introduce continuous steel teeming, vacuuming, thermal hardening, and the like, the appropriate equipment is needed; this equipment is being produced at a rate several times below what is necessary. However, no more than 5 percent of production capital investment goes for its production. An unbalance appears, for example, in that much more capital is invested in chemistry, metallurgy, and coal extraction than in production capacities to produce machines needed for these sectors.

As a result, the machine building complex and sectors associated with it which have enormous labor and material resources at their disposal and steadily increase them do not properly fulfill the national economic tasks which they face. This frequently limits possibilities to solve a number of fundamental problems of production since scientific advances are realized mainly through machine tool and instrument building.

In the present five-year plan faster development of the machine building industry is planned as compared to industrial production on the whole. Specifically, output of the USSR machine building industry will increase by a factor of 1.4 and the machine building complex should account for 40 percent of the total increase in industrial output. At the same time the structure of the complex will become more flexible and receptive to technical innovations and discoveries and able to introduce genuinely qualitative changes into production. In the current five-year plan, USSR production of machine tools will decrease by 200,000 units to 170-180,000 units while replacement of the stock of equipment will be stepped up by a factor of 1.5-2.

We will cite one of many examples which show that surpassing the world technical level is a task which is fully attainable for the USSR and other socialist countries. The USSR today produces more electrophysical and electrochemical machine tools and in a broader assortment than any other country in the world, although two decades ago only a few specialists knew about them. Thus, for example, in terms of degree of automation and precision there is nothing abroad like the new model of electrochemical machine tool with an adaptive-programmed device. Impulse-cyclical processing, which insures a several-fold increase in precision and a sharp reduction of manual labor when manufacturing complex articles, was used in its design.

The ratio between the production of metal cutting machine tools and forge-press machines is undergoing especially great changes to the benefit of the latter. The Soviet Union will manufacture 220,000 better-quality forge-press machines in 1985 and their share in total production of metal cutting equipment will rise to 24 percent. This will help reequip semifinished parts production facilities with more contemporary equipment which will enable them to produce semifinished parts closer in form to future parts. If, in addition, part of the capital which goes for mechanical processing of a semifinished part (removal of shavings) were spent for the modernization and technical reequipment of semifinished parts production, a large part of metal cutting machine tools would not be needed. And this would make it possible to release thousands of machine tool operators, who are much needed.

When there is a powerful production apparatus and a high rate of scientific-technical progress, the problem of updating the stock of machine tools cannot

be solved by replacing them with new equipment alone. An important direction is modernization. Increasing the efficiency of the machine building industry helps create new capacities with an orientation to specialized production while simultaneously increasing the level of specialization and cooperation in already existing production facilities and capacities. Functional specialization of machine building is a promising direction. It opens up extensive opportunities to compose and combine a large part (up to 90 percent) of machine systems with ready-made functional assemblies when there is a network of specialized enterprises and associations.

Solving all these problems will make it possible to increase the degree of balance of the economy of the socialist countries on the level of matching production and consumption for three parameters: volume, assortment, and cost, as well as efficiency. The main goal of balance is to eliminate sharp differences between sectors with a high efficiency of resource use and connected sectors. The efficiency level in the latter is significantly lower than socially necessary; therefore, they have a retarding influence on the entire process of production intensification. A balance in efficiency will occur when all sectors of the national economy reach the progressive frontiers of science and engineering.

Achieving balance in the economies of the socialist countries with respect to efficiency depends more and more on intensifying the interaction of internal (national) and foreign (international) factors of economic growth. It is precisely these factors which are the most important feature of the formative period of the new type of expanded reproduction in the CEMA countries which conforms to the capabilities and demands of developed socialist society. The conversion of the CEMA countries to a primarily intensive path of development in the 1980's makes new demands on foreign economic ties and makes it necessary to intensify these ties.

As the Declaration of the Conference of CEMA member-countries noted, its participants "once again confirm the firm intention of their countries to develop fruitful trade-economic and scientific-technical ties with all socialist, developing, and developed capitalist countries which demonstrate readiness for this. They consider it advisable to expand these ties on the basis of long-term programs and agreements and to apply various mutually advantageous forms of cooperation." The center of gravity in cooperation is switching to production and scientific-technical cooperation. This presupposes a concentration of efforts in those directions of cooperation which insure the greatest contribution to accelerating technical progress and increasing aggregate production and scientific-technical potential and thereby the position of the CEMA member-countries in the world economy. This concentration of efforts is insured above all by economically substantiated selection of priority directions, closely correlating foreign economic measures with optimization of the structures of the national economies.

The integration stage of cooperation is characterized by the fact that efficiency criteria determine the selection of forms and directions of cooperation to an increasingly greater extent. The sphere of the global approach to determining economic efficiency as the dominant stimulus to participation in international division of labor is being expanded. The

degree of impact of cooperation on the qualitative transformation of sectors and production facilities, progress in output assortment, and the conduct of resource conservation policy, under which the same or even a reduced volume of resources is used while final results rise, are becoming increasingly important criteria of the success of cooperation.

All this presupposes a higher degree of coordination of future tasks and further development of the mechanism for realization of coordinated goals of economic policy. Its basic purpose is to help accelerate scientific-technical progress and convert the economy of the CEMA member countries to a primarily intensive path of development.

The decision of the summit Economic Conference of CEMA Countries to deepen the coordination of economic policies related to mutual cooperation is exceptionally important. The Announcement says: "By coordination the CEMA member-countries mean the development on a collective basis of ways to solve important economic problems which are of mutual interest and importance for each fraternal country in determining directions of economic development and cooperation for the long run, and for the joint determination of paths of direct interaction in the spheres of science, engineering, material production, and capital construction."

All creative activity of the CEMA countries based on their multilateral cooperation is expected to insure the dynamic and harmonious development of each country's economy and of the entire community as a whole. The performance of these exceptionally important tasks is possible on the basis of multilateral intensification of production and the utilization of world achievements in the field of scientific-technical progress.

For the first time the problem of coordinating national economic plans has been posed as a problem of paramount importance and significance. The coordination will be focused on performing priority tasks and will be the main instrument for coordinating economic policies in fields related to mutual cooperation (and interested countries may also do this in other fields of the formation of stable economic and scientific-technical ties among the CEMA member-countries), as well as the basis for developing their national plans in the part involved with mutual cooperation.

Socialist economic integration is an important stabilizing factor of world-wide development. The growing opportunities and needs of the CEMA countries for economic ties reflect favorably on the international economic situation. The expansion of mutually advantageous cooperation with other states is a counterforce to the policies of reactionary imperialist circles who are undermining detente.

The integrated type of cooperation is assuming an intensive thrust and stimulating resource and environmental conservation in the reproduction cycle. This substantially reduces the vulnerability of national economies to the negative influence of the capitalist economy. Socialism is able to successfully solve the most complex national and international problems, documents of the summit Economic Conference of CEMA Countries emphasize.

The experience and practices of the CEMA member-countries convincingly demonstrate the fundamental advantages inherent in socialism over capitalism such as social and national equality; planned development of the economy; the ideological solidarity of society; confidence in the future; constant concern for man; and comprehensive development of the individual. On this basis the socialist way of life is being enriched, the political system of socialism is being developed, and socialist democracy is being improved in the cause of guaranteeing man the broadest rights and freedoms.

The economic and social progress of the CEMA member-countries contrasts sharply with the crisis situation in capitalist countries. The inability of capitalism to rid itself of profound economic crises and severe sociopolitical upheavals is being confirmed anew. The achievements of the CEMA countries in building socialism and consolidating relations of friendship and cooperation is having a very positive influence on world development. By consistently realizing in practice the principles of a new type of interstate relations in their mutual cooperation, as well as in ties with other countries, socialist cooperation is making an effective contribution to the reorganization of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis.

FOOTNOTE

1. EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA, No 26, 1982.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

12424

CSO: 1816/8

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ETHIOPIAN REVOLUTION DETAILED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 11,
Nov 84 pp 35-47

[Article by Ye. Denisov: "Ethiopia -- A Step into the Future"]

[Excerpts] On 12 September of this year Socialist Ethiopia was 10 years old. This anniversary coincided with a historic event in the country's life -- the formation of the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia (PWPE) -- the vanguard party of workers which relies on the ideological and organizational principles of Marxism-Leninism. The CPSU Central Committee's speech of welcome to the constitutional congress of the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia says: "The formation of the PWPE is a great victory for the working class and for all of Ethiopia's workers and the natural result of the consistent realization of the ideals of the Ethiopian Revolution."

Ten years ago, on 12 September 1974, a group of soldiers entered the apartments of the imperial palace in Addis-Ababa. They were met by a little old man, shriveled from time, fear, and bitterness -- "the emperor of emperors, the anointed one of God, the invincible lion of Judea" -- Emperor Haile Selassie the First. The vigorous young officer stepped forward, unfolded a sheet of official paper, and read a decree deposing the emperor. He was put in a motor vehicle and taken from the palace.

This event put an end to the history of the oldest empire on Tropical African territory. The history, looking to the future and full of many difficulties, of the new state of Socialist Ethiopia had begun.

The Past

Right up to 1974 Ethiopia was one of the most politically stable countries of the developing world. In this "island of political stability," as foreign journalists loved to write, in conditions of "reverent worship" and "nation-wide obedience," Emperor Haile Selassie had been on the throne since 1930. Nonetheless, this stability was illusory. The historically doomed feudal-monarchistic regime was disintegrating and in its death agony.

An Explosion of Public Outrage

The imperial regime's inability and lack of desire to implement an effective program to eliminate age-old socioeconomic backwardness ultimately led to a political explosion; it took place in February 1974. The drought which had hit a number of provinces was a direct cause of this explosion. More than 200,000 residents of rural regions died of starvation. About 2 million head of livestock died. Not only did the imperial government not rush to the aid of the people who had suffered; it tried to hide the scope of the calamity from world public opinion and from its own people. It became known only through reports from the foreign press and radio. The public was deeply shaken and angered by the criminal way the emperor and his government had treated the tragedy which had befallen the population.

Finally, the Ethiopian economy, which was very dependent on foreign capital (Italian, French, West German, Israeli, and American companies accounted for 70 percent of investments in industry), fully experienced the consequences of the energy crisis. Prices for gasoline and other petroleum products, and accordingly for foodstuffs and industrial goods, rose in the country. The patience of the people was exhausted.

In February 1974 the underlying discontent of various strata of the population mounted into a strike in the capital by taxi and bus drivers, employees of the national airline, and construction workers. Teachers and students in higher and secondary educational institutions suspended classes and joined in demonstrations of the unemployed and youth. Spontaneous turbulence among the peasants began in the countryside. On 25 February soldiers of the military garrison in Asmer revolted. Servicemen of the navy and air force and men stationed in the capital and Harar garrisons joined them.

In the initial stage of mass actions by the popular masses such forms of struggle as sending petitions to the emperor and government asking for better living conditions, higher wages, and lower prices were widely used. But later they began making political as well as economic demands: revision of the constitution, granting of political liberties, agrarian reform, bringing members of the reactionary government to trial, and elimination of religious and nationality inequality.

From the beginning the imperial government tried to establish order by force and threats, but under pressure of the demands of the popular masses and the army, it resigned on 27 February. This was the people's first victory. Representatives of all branches of the armed forces announced full support of the demands of the popular masses. For the first time Ethiopian armed forces demonstrated their solidarity and made it understood that they must be reckoned with. From that time the Armed Forces Movement appeared in the political arena.

The new cabinet of ministers on the one hand tried to push aside the former prime minister's influential group and find a "suitable replacement" for the emperor, and on the other, to deal with the leaders of the Armed Forces Movement and the organizers of the actions of the popular masses. One cannot help recalling the pronouncement of Karl Marx, who wrote that the bourgeoisie

"know better than anyone what is wrong with them. They know that during the revolution the simple people are emboldened and go too far. Therefore the gentlemen of the bourgeoisie try as much as possible to transform absolute monarchy into bourgeois monarchy without revolution, in a peaceful way."¹

But the reactionary conspiracy against the people was not destined to be carried out. On 7 March the first general strike in Ethiopia's history began. Political demands supported by broad strata of the urban and rural population resounded in the slogans put forth by the strikers. The government tried to throw the army and the police against the strikers. But in vain! The armed forces did not follow the conspirators. Troops entered Addis-Ababa on the night of 26-27 April. Dozens of former ministers, high-ranking officials, and bureaucrats were arrested. The military announced the creation of the Coordinating Committee of the Armed Forces, Police, and Territorial Army (CCAF) in order to guarantee the public's security and carry out the reforms promised to the people. From that point on, a diarchy -- the CCAF and the imperial government -- became firmly established in the country for a certain period of time; neither of them had a decisive advantage.

In the course of time it became increasingly clear that the armed forces not only had the real power, controlling the actions of the government, but that they also had a definite program of actions, unlike the government. The prime minister, E. Makonnen, was arrested in late July. By proposal of the Coordinating Committee, M. Imry -- a well-known and experienced politician -- was named the new prime minister. But this government was in power for only a month and a half. The CCAF attacked the regime's holy of holies -- the imperial throne. First the Crown Council, the Chancellery of the Emperor's Personal Military Staff, and the Supreme Imperial Court were abolished. The property of Haile Selassie the First, his family, and more than 200 arrested feudal lords and important state figures was nationalized. The land, palaces, factories, plants, companies, and capital they owned were transferred to state control. Finally, on 12 September 1974, the Coordinating Committee announced the dethronement of Haile Selassie because of his "spiritual and physical infirmity and inability to bring the country out of the difficult situation," as well as the decision to place him under the protection of the armed forces. The CCAF took over the functions of head of state; since 15 September it had come to be called the Provisional Military Administrative Council (PMAC).

The period of diarchy thus came to an end in Ethiopia. The dethroning of the monarch (but not yet the elimination of the monarchy -- a special CCAF decree announced that on 21 March 1975) meant the victory of the Armed Forces Movement, which in that stage acted in league with the working class, the peasantry, the students, and the intelligentsia as well as with certain circles of the national bourgeoisie who were interested in restricting the dominance of the feudal lords, which had held back the development of capitalist relations in the country.

A Revolution Without a Party Is Impossible

The Ethiopian revolution was unique because there were no political parties which could supervise the actions of the broad popular masses in the country. The patriotically inclined military took the function of political vanguard on

itself. The Coordinating Committee of the Armed Forces, Territorial Army, and Police and then the Provisional Military Administrative Council repeatedly announced the need to create a ruling political party in the country.

On 20 April 1976, the CCAF published the Program of the National-Democratic Revolution of Ethiopia. Proclaimed as the main goals of the revolution were "complete deliverance from feudalism, imperialism, and the bourgeois bureaucratism of the state apparatus, the unification of all antifeudal and antiimperialist forces in the struggle to build a new Ethiopia and create a strong base in the country for converting to socialism,"² increased political consciousness of the working masses, and the creation of social, trade union, and creative organizations and, above all, a ruling political party.

The Program said that the victory of the revolution could be insured only on the condition that all antifeudal and antiimperialist forces of the country, which would be given the opportunity to create political and mass organizations, be united. In turn, the government had to give assistance and practical support to these forces during the creation of the vanguard party based on the ideological foundations of scientific socialism.³

By that time five main political groupings which had proclaimed support of the revolution were in operation -- the "All-Ethiopian Socialist Movement," which mainly relied on students, progressive circles of former refugee opposition to the emperor's regime, and state bureaucrats; the "Proletarian League," which consisted of representatives of trade unions, the intelligentsia, and military people; the "Marxist-Leninist Revolution Organization," which combined students and the intelligentsia; the "Revolutionary Struggle of the Oppressed Masses of Ethiopia" organization, which expressed the interests of the peasants, national minorities, small merchants, and craftsmen; and the "Revolutionary Banner," which primarily consisted of representatives of the armed forces (most CCAF members were also members).

These organizations acted from positions near to Marxism, propagandized the ideas of scientific socialism, and conducted explanatory work among the workers. But because of petty bourgeois social composition, they characteristically were inconsistent and hesitant and went too fast in advancing political slogans and determining the revolution's stages of development.

The progressive leadership of Ethiopia understood that supervising the work on the fundamental socioeconomic transformation of the country was a task which only a ruling vanguard political party was up to. That is why this leadership persistently maintained a course to unite all the progressive revolutionary forces. "Guided by the words of Lenin that the proletariat needs a party guided by progressive theory -- Marxism, from the very beginning the Ethiopian revolution has been applying great efforts to unite and organize all progressive forces and to increase the level of their political consciousness and ideological armament,"⁴ emphasized Mengistu Haile Mariam at that time.

In February 1977 a joint announcement of the five groupings mentioned above was published on joining together -- in order to create a vanguard party of the working class -- in the "Union" of Marxist-Leninist organizations of

Ethiopia (UMLOE)." In June of the same year its coordinating committee published the program of actions of the Union, which envisioned the elimination of the contradictions in political platforms of the groupings, development by them of a general policy, and finally their organizational unification.

Nonetheless, the Union member organizations did not have agreed opinions on such pressing problems of the Ethiopian revolution as the nature of the future state power, the nationality question, and others. Moreover, despite agreement on the equality of all participants, an acute struggle for leadership was going on in the Union.

It was decided to create a unified organizational center from among the active participants in the revolutionary movement -- the UMLOE members as well as other persons who "possessed revolutionary qualities and met certain requirements." The Commission for the Organization of the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia (COPWE) became this center and the chairman of the CCAF, Mengistu Haile Mariam, was charged with heading it.

On 17 December 1979 Mengistu Haile Mariam addressed the nation and officially announced the formation of the Commission. He emphasized that the Commission was not a party but a special organized political organ and a unique school where its members could accumulate experience in party work and prove their ability to be useful to the party in practice. The CCAF ratified the Commission for the Organization of the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia^a as the only political organization and entrusted it with all work to consolidate Ethiopian Marxists into a unified party and spread Marxist-Leninism among the popular masses. The activity of all other political organizations was prohibited, and opposition to the work of the COPWE and its members was declared a capital crime.⁵

The formation of the COPWE was an appropriate step for the specific conditions of the country. It met the complete support of the working masses. The correctness of this step was confirmed in practice by the results of its activities in the four years of its existence. During this time everything necessary was done to insure the qualitative composition of the future political organization and to prevent uncontrolled actions and mistakes, which are possible without proper experience.

Methods to solve problems of the country's domestic and foreign policy were developed and questions of party building, the organizational and ideological principles of the formation of the party, and establishing reliable links between the future party and its social base were discussed at COPWE congresses and plenums of its central committee. Concerned for the qualitative social composition and reserve of the party, the COPWE undertook extensive work to create mass social organizations in the country. Main attention was devoted to representation of the working class and the working peasantry -- the main moving forces of the revolution -- as well as to other progressive strata of Ethiopian society.

As a result, numerous mass organizations are actively working today, such as the All-Ethiopian Trade Union which unites about 300,000 industrial workers,

the All-Ethiopian Peasant Association which includes about 5 million peasant households, the Association of the Youth of Revolutionary Ethiopia which numbers more than 3.5 million young men and women, the Association of Women of Revolutionary Ethiopia with about 5 million members, and the Association of Urban Residents which encompasses approximately 4.4 million people or about 15 percent of the population, as well as trade and creative associations and unions of teachers, writers, journalists, theater employees, musicians, and artists. It is precisely from these classes and strata of society that COPWE has drawn personnel for the future party.

In addition, organs of people's control which insure that state organizations and workers treat material valuables and the people's property carefully, strictly observe production, labor, and financial discipline, and fight against legal offenses have been created and are working actively in Ethiopia.

COPWE has conducted extensive work to propagandize the ideas of scientific socialism among its members and the population. In cities and villages, industrial enterprises and peasant cooperatives, ministries and educational institutions, and military units and residential quarters, they have set up debate forums to study the foundations of Marxist-Leninism and circles to train members of the party which is being formed.

Such publications as the daily newspaper of the COPWE Central Committee SERTOADER (The Worker) and the quarterly theoretical journal MESKEREM (September) with circulations of 103,000 and 113,000 copies, respectively, have helped disseminate political knowledge. The first volume of "Das Kapital" by Karl Marx was translated into the Amharic language and published for the constitutional congress. The "Manifesto of the Communist Party" by K. Marx and F. Engels, V.I. Lenin's works "Gosudarstvo i revoliutsiya" [State and Revolution] and "Dve taktiki sotsial-demokratii v demokraticheskoy revoliutsii" [Two Tactics of Social Democracy in Democratic Revolution], and works devoted to the experience of building socialism in the USSR and other countries were translated and published and a textbook of political economy was published.

About 3,000 activists and executive workers of COPWE and the future party have been trained within the walls of the Political School imeni February 1974 Revolution (Yekatit-66) and its branches. Many hundreds of activists have received political training in the USSR and other socialist countries.

In the final stage of preparation for the congress -- in January-August 1984, the party admitted about 30 percent of the COPWE members, with preference given to representatives of the working class and the peasantry. Constitutional party meetings and conferences took place throughout the whole country; they set up leadership organs of party organizations and elected delegates to the constitutional congress of the PWPE. "The constitutional congresses were in truth schools of new political culture for both the members of the future party and for the whole society,"⁶ said Mengistu Haile Mariam at the 8th Plenum of the COPWE Central Committee.

At the constitutional congress of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia which took place in Addis-Ababa on 6-10 September 1984, 1,742 delegates and representatives of social organizations, numerous foreign guests, and

delegations of socialist countries, among them the CPSU delegation headed by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee G.V. Romanov, and delegations of communist, workers, and revolutionary-democratic parties, national-liberation movements, and progressive international organizations were welcomed.

The congress discussed and approved Mengistu Haile Mariam's report on COPWE activities and proclaimed the creation of the vanguard party guided by the principles of Marxist-Leninism -- the Workers' Party of Ethiopia. The Program and Charter of the WPE and other documents were adopted. Leading organs of the party -- the Central Committee, the Central Committee Politburo, the Secretariat, the Central Auditing Commission, and the Central Control Commission -- were elected. Mengistu Haile Mariam was elected General Secretary of the WPE Central Committee.

The formation of the vanguard party opens up a new chapter in the struggle of the Ethiopian people to build a society free of exploitation. "The Ethiopian revolution," notes Mengistu Haile Mariam, "which with its first steps promoted antifeudal, antiimperialist goals and has continually adhered to this policy, consolidating its conquests in various fields during the struggle, is today in the process of completing one of the most important stages of its development: the immediate historical goal is to guarantee conditions for the conversion to building socialism."

The WPE Program, Mengistu Haile Mariam emphasizes, relies on scientific analysis of national, African, and international conditions taking into account the contemporary level of development of the revolution in Ethiopia. The scientific nature of the Program as well as the creation of reliable material and spiritual conditions for creating the foundations of a new society even further increase confidence that under the leadership of the WPE, the people of Ethiopia will achieve victory.⁸

Now on the agenda is the question of the creation of a new state and political system -- a people's democratic republic and the development of a new constitution in accordance with which a policy to resolve the nationality issue will begin to be realized.

Defending Revolutionary Conquests

The numerous foreign guests and representatives of the workers of Ethiopia did not watch the passage of troops and military equipment along Revolution Square in Addis-Ababa without agitation. This was a demonstration of the military might of the young republic and its readiness to defend the achievements of the revolution and to give a deserved response to any intrigues by foreign aggressors and internal counterrevolution.

The country had taken a long, difficult path to this day. Revolutions are not easy. Ethiopia is no exception. The drought and famine of 1974 was intensified by the economic decline, the sabotage of merchants, and terrorist sorties. The most serious ordeal fell to the unfortunate country's lot in the summer of 1977 when the ruling circles of Somali began armed aggression against it. Taking advantage of the internal difficulties which the

revolutionary regime was enduring, and at the instigation of the imperialist powers and reactionary Arab regimes, the Somalian leaders conceived the idea of seizing almost a third of Ethiopia's territory by force of arms.

In the days of the bleak ordeals the Provisional Military Administrative Council appealed to the people to stand up and defend the revolution. With the fervent slogans "The Revolutionary Homeland or Death!" and "Everything for the Front!" the people rose to fight. Adults and young people went off as volunteers to the front. Throughout the country money, food, and things were collected for the front. The Tarek people's militia training camp was set up on the outskirts of Addis-Ababa; within a few months 300,000 people's militiamen went through training there -- people whose origins were the working class, the peasantry, and various tribes and nationalities of the country. Battalions of people's militia then became members of the subdivisions of the regular army which were operating against the aggressors.

By the end of 1977 the situation on the fronts had become so critical that the government was forced to appeal to the socialist states for help. The Soviet Union, the Republic of Cuba, and the GDR as well as the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen went to the aid of the Ethiopian revolution. In March 1978 the Revolutionary Armed Forces of the country drove the interventionists from their territory. The aggressor suffered a crushing defeat. At the moment the war ended Somali had only 30 tanks and 9 serviceable fighter planes. In just the 3 months of the counterattack by Ethiopian troops, the Somalis lost 40,000 dead and wounded.

The circles of international reaction and aggression and the followers of narrow-minded nationalism, political adventurism, and expansionism received a graphic lesson, instructive to others, from the forces of international liberation and social progress.

The Ethiopian people and their leaders maintain a sense of gratitude to the countries of the socialist community and to all progressive forces in the world for support in their homeland's hour of difficulty. Mengistu Haile Mariam announced on 12 September 1978: "On behalf of the broad masses of Ethiopia, I want to thank the Communist Party of the Soviet Union -- the first country of socialism and the bastion of the international working class and the forces of national liberation and social progress -- for the enormous material aid and political support which they have given."⁹

Today the achievements of the Ethiopian revolution are reliably guarded by the Revolutionary Armed Forces. After the defeat of the Somalian aggressors, the country's leaders came to the conclusion that the armed forces had to be reorganized and an army had to be created on a fundamentally new basis, conforming to the contemporary level of technical equipment and personnel training. The party leadership and the Provisional Military Administrative Council adopted a number of decisions in this direction. A law on universal military duty was announced, political organs were set up in the armed forces, border troops were formed, the structure of the armed forces was reorganized, and old officer cadres were gradually replaced by young officers who had received military education both in Ethiopia and in the socialist states. The Revolutionary Armed Forces are the pride of the Ethiopian people; they are

closely tied to the workers and are a reliable buttress of the revolutionary regime.

The Program of the Revolutionary Party of Ethiopia envisions further strengthening the armed forces and indoctrinating servicemen in the spirit of patriotism and proletarian internationalism.

FOOTNOTES

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Sochineniya" [Works], Vol 4, p 314.
2. "Basic Documents of the Ethiopian Revolution", Addis-Ababa, 1977, p 11.
3. Ibid., p 16.
4. Quote from AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA, No 11, 1980, p 10.
5. See: "Towards Party Formation", Addis-Ababa, 1979, p 56.
6. THE ETHIOPIAN HERALD, 28 August 1984.
7. KOMMUNIST, No 13, 1984, p 95.
8. Ibid.
9. "Fourth Anniversary of the Ethiopian Revolution", Addis-Ababa, 1978, p 13.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

12424

CSO: 1816/8

GDR ANNIVERSARY ARTICLE STRESSES 'SOCIALIST SOLIDARITY'

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 11, Nov 84 pp 86-93

[Article by G. Kirillov under the rubric "Glorious Anniversaries": "The German Democratic Republic Is 35 Years Old"]

[Excerpts] The German Democratic Republic was 35 years old on 7 October 1984. The formation of the GDR was an event of truly exceptional significance, an important stage of world revolutionary progress, and a component of the worldwide historical epoch of the conversion from capitalism to socialism which was begun by the Great October Revolution. The formation of this country confirmed the fundamental changes to the benefit of socialism in the ratio of forces in the international arena which occurred as a result of the victory of the Soviet people over the common enemy of mankind -- fascism. A state of workers and peasants has been created for the first time on German soil, which for many years was the citadel of one of the most aggressive detachments of world imperialism.

II

The achievements of the GDR in building a developed socialist society not only attest to the talent and diligence of its citizens and the great organizing role of the country's vanguard -- the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. These achievements are at the same time one more convincing demonstration of the force of socialist solidarity; the Soviet Union and other socialist states have stood beside the GDR and given all-out support for all the years of the its existence.

In the article "Our Republic -- A State of Peace and Socialism," published in the anniversary edition of EINHEIT, the theoretical journal of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) Central Committee, the chairman of the Council of State, E. Honecker noted: "Fraternal cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is a necessary foundation for the successful development of the GDR. The USSR's help in building socialism began in the first hours after our people's liberation from fascism."

Firm friendship and close cooperation with the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries of socialism serve as the basis of the GDR's foreign

policy. The republic makes its own contribution toward strengthening the unity and solidarity of the socialist community. It actively participates in the activities of the Warsaw Pact Organization. Hand in hand with its treaty partners the GDR has done a great deal to thwart the aggressive intrigues of imperialism and to deflect the threat of war from mankind. It is a great service of the countries of the socialist community, among them the GDR, that the peoples of Europe have already lived in conditions of peace for 40 years and that the vicious circle where the postwar period was replaced by preparation for a new war, and ultimately -- by war, was broken. The republic is honorably fulfilling the mission it has taken upon itself to do everything in its power to insure that the threat of war never comes from German land.

Today, when reactionary imperialist circles headed by the present American administration try to achieve military superiority over the world of socialism and step up the arms race for this purpose, the GDR is initiating proper measures to insure the security of the socialist community. Because of the deployment of the new American missiles in Western Europe, above all in the FRG, an agreement was reached between the Soviet Union and the GDR to deploy long-range operational-tactical missiles on the republic's territory.

At the same time it is actively realizing proposals included in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact member-states adopted in Prague (January 1983) and the joint announcement of leading party and state figures of the socialist countries in Moscow (June 1983). These proposals are a constructive and realistic program for solving urgent world problems.

The SED and the GDR government attach primary significance to cooperation with fraternal countries within the framework of CEMA. The GDR sees one of the decisive conditions of the country's stable economic and social development in intensifying socialist economic integration. CEMA states account for more than two-thirds of its foreign trade turnover.

The GDR has made its contribution toward building and operating the Druzhba Oil Pipeline and creating the Mir Unified Energy System, the Unified Institute of Nuclear Research in Dueben, the International Bank for Economic Assistance, the International Investment Bank, and other CEMA organizations. The republic's national economic plans envision further expansion of integrated ties with other participants in the Council and special attention is being devoted to specialization and cooperation in production. The import of articles created on the basis of specialization and cooperation in production plays a fundamental role in the republic's development. Their proportion in exports to other CEMA countries exceeds 40 percent.

The summit Economic Conference of CEMA Member-Countries was met with great satisfaction in the GDR. The joint announcement of the SED Central Committee Politburo and the GDR Council of Ministers published on 21 June 1984 approved documents adopted at the Conference and outlined measures to implement them. The announcement emphasizes that the GDR will help insure that cooperation within the CEMA framework is oriented to production intensification.

The announcement also points out the extreme importance of the measures outlined for deepening and coordination by the CEMA member-countries of

economic policy. In the present stage, these measures serve as a decisive precondition to increased efficiency of cooperation within the CEMA framework. Relying on the decisions of the 10th SED Congress, the GDR will make an active contribution toward putting the agreements achieved in Moscow into practice, the announcement noted.

As CPSU documents have repeatedly emphasized, in addition to the flourishing of every socialist nation and consolidation of the sovereignty of the socialist states, their interrelations are becoming increasingly closer and more and more common elements are emerging in their politics, economies, and social life. The experience of cooperation between the USSR and the GDR in particular confirms the scientific soundness of this important theoretical conclusion.

be exit area
t 1 122
122 02 12
III

The intensification of the interaction of the two countries in all spheres of social life is primarily the result of the purposeful activity of the parties. The fraternal military alliance of the CPSU and the SED based on their strong loyalty to the principles of Marxist-Leninism and socialist internationalism is the core of the cooperation between the countries and the foundation on which the diverse ties and contacts embracing millions of people are being developed and strengthened.

The SED is devoting a great deal of attention to reinforcing fraternal unity with the party and country of Lenin. Its present program says that the "inviolable friendship and cooperation with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people was, is, and will remain the source of power and the foundation of development of the socialist German Democratic Republic."

In an interview which E. Honecker gave on 18 August 1984 to the NEUES DEUTSCHLAND and BERLINER ZEITUNG papers as well as the ADN press agency, he stated: "The 35 years of the GDR simultaneously mark 35 years of the closest friendship with the Soviet Union, our ally in good and difficult days. This friendship is an affair which concerns us closely and in the 35 years since the formation of the GDR, it has been reinforced and become inviolable. The victory of the Red Army over Hitler's fascism revealed a path to a new future for our people. More than 20 million Soviet citizens fell in this struggle. Their legacy is sacred to us. It is being fulfilled in the GDR. In full accordance with this, the celebrations on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the GDR will be part of the preparations for the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the historic victory of the Soviet Union over Hitler's fascism and the liberation of the German people."

For their part the leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet State continually take care to develop and improve relations with the SED and the German Democratic Republic and make cooperation more vital and dynamic. Contacts between the USSR and the GDR on the party, state, and social levels multiply every year. Regular meetings of innovators and rationalizers of production, the exchange of production brigades, and fraternal ties of cities and oblasts of the USSR with cities and districts of the GDR have become the norm of life.

Days of culture, exhibitions, and youth festivals mutually enrich the cultural and spiritual life of the two peoples.

In conditions where the economy of the capitalist states is sinking ever deeper into the mire of crisis, the fraternal socialist countries are demonstrating the stability and inviolability of their ties and firm confidence in tomorrow. Economic cooperation between the USSR and the GDR is steadily rising to a qualitatively higher level. We will recall that the Soviet Union (it accounts for 38 percent of the GDR's foreign trade turnover) is its most important trade partner. In 1984 commodity turnover between the countries will reach an enormous volume, 14 billion rubles; in other words, it will increase by a factor of 47 as compared to 1950.

The benefit from this is great and reciprocal. It is very important to the GDR that it can receive equipment for atomic and thermal power stations, enterprises of chemical and metallurgic industries, diesel engines, excavators, planes, machine tools, tractors, trucks, cars, electronic equipment, and other items of the machine building industry from the Soviet Union. The large and stable deliveries from the USSR of such types of raw materials, fuel, and processed materials as petroleum, natural gas, hard coal and coke, iron ore, cotton, and rolled ferrous metals play an enormous role in developing the national economy of the GDR, which has a relatively limited raw materials base. Through these deliveries the GDR covers 100 percent of its import needs for natural gas, 90 percent for petroleum, 90 percent for cotton, and 78 percent for rolled metals.

The GDR makes important deliveries for the USSR national economy, above all machines and equipment, output of the chemical, ceramic, and light industries, instrument building, and optics. Through deliveries from the GDR, the Soviet Union covers 25 percent of its import needs for metal cutting machine tools, forge-press equipment, ships, passenger railroad cars, and chemical, textile, polygraphic, and refrigerator equipment. Almost one-sixth of the consumer goods imported by the USSR come from the GDR.

The following facts also attest to the great diversity and breadth of the steadily increasing mutually advantageous ties. Today there is not one sectorial ministry in the USSR or in the GDR which to some degree or another has not collaborated with its partner in the other country. There are 175 intergovernmental and interdepartmental agreements between the USSR and the GDR on cooperation in the fields of science, engineering, and production. Of the GDR's state plan on science and engineering, 80 percent is carried out in close cooperation with the Soviet Union.

In this way, the quest to combine resources and scientific research and industrial potentials and take advantage of the strengths of socialist division of labor determines the nature of the states' economic relations. Such cooperation has been most extensively developed in chemistry, power engineering, machine building, and residential and industrial construction. Workers, scientists, engineers, and designers of the Soviet Union and the GDR have, through joint efforts, developed, for example: a highly efficient device for producing polyethylene using the "Polymer-50" high pressure method -- it is in operation in Novopolotsk; a unique plasma steel melting furnace with a

30,000 ton capacity, operating in Freital; a number of machine tools with programmed control; the Neva electronic unit; the MKF-6 multizone camera which is used by the cosmonauts of the socialist countries; the KS-6 beet harvesting combine, which conforms to the best world models; and others.

The Soviet Union is giving technical assistance to the GDR in building and reconstructing enterprises and projects of electrical power engineering, chemistry, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, and the construction industry. Thermal and atomic power plants with a total capacity of 15 million kilowatts have been built and are being built in the republic with the Soviet Union's help. The Boksberg thermal electric power plant, the largest in Europe operating on lignite, and the Tirschbach thermal electric power plant have been built. The Entschvalde Station with a capacity of 3 million kilowatts is under construction. The Rhinesberg atomic power plant --the first atomic power plant in the GDR -- was built with the Soviet Union's help. The Nord atomic power plant with a capacity of 3.5 million kilowatts and the Stendahl plant with a capacity of 1 million kilowatts are under construction. The USSR also helped build a number of other projects which play an important role in the GDR economy.

For its part the GDR is taking an active part in building and expanding a number of integrated projects in the USSR (the Ust-Ilimskiy Timber Management Complex, the Kiyembayevskiy Asbestos Mining-Enriching Combine, the Orenburg-USSR Western Border and the Urengoy-Uzhgorod Gas Lines) and building facilities in the petroleum industry and for producing iron-containing raw materials, ferroalloys, and feed proteins. The German friends have begun reconstructing several enterprises of Soviet light industry.

Economic cooperation between the countries is being steadily improved and is becoming more and more widespread. Its basic directions are planned for many years ahead. The signing in October 1984 of the Program of Cooperation Between the USSR and the GDR in the Fields of Science, Engineering, and Production Until the year 2000 during the visit of a Soviet party-governmental delegation to the GDR was an important stage in this path. It opens up new prospects for accelerating scientific-technical progress and developing it on the basis of the leading sectors of the economy, as well as further increasing the level of well-being of the peoples of both countries.

On 7 October 1984, when the 35th anniversary of the GDR was celebrated, 9 years had passed since the day the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance was signed between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic. This coincidence is deeply symbolic. The signing of the Treaty on Friendship not only opened a new page in fraternal relations between both countries. It represents an important event in the life of all countries participating in the Warsaw Pact and the entire socialist community.

The Treaty establishes the basic directions of mutual cooperation for the long-term future in accordance with the common goals of building developed socialism and a communist society in the GDR. The Treaty is permeated with concern for strengthening universal peace and security. It envisions a broad program of actions aimed at progressive normalization of the international situation and consolidation of the positions of socialism in the world. The

USSR and the GDR have accepted mutual obligations to make every effort to stop the arms race and introduce universal and complete disarmament in order to exclude war from the life of peoples.

The idea of military-political cooperation in the interests of peace and security has been further developed and refined in the Treaty. The Soviet Union and the GDR are taking obligations upon themselves to jointly and in alliance with other fraternal countries participating in the Warsaw Pact to guarantee the inviolability of the borders which took shape as a result of World War II and postwar development, among them the border between the GDR and the FRG. They are also accepting the obligation to undertake joint efforts to oppose any manifestations of revanchism and militarism.

All this is extremely urgent inasmuch as forces which would like to change the present territorial-political face of Europe to their own satisfaction and strangle socialism have not died out in the NATO countries, above all the FRG, at this point. They have also not stopped trying to undermine the social order in the German Democratic Republic. In Bonn recently there has been increasingly persistent talk of some kind of "open" German question, the "reunification of Germany," and even a "German Reich within the 1937 borders." Revanchism is being revealed more and more strongly on the domestic policy scene of the FRG. Nonetheless, it is past time to understand that the territorial-political realities which have taken shape in Europe are safely secured. The borders of the socialist states are protected with the help of the Warsaw Pact. Socialism has gained a firm foothold in the German Democratic Republic.

The time since conclusion of the 1975 Treaty has convincingly demonstrated that it successfully serves the joining of knowledge, experience, and material and spiritual resources for the good of the peoples of the USSR and the GDR. Cooperation is being steadily intensified and is assuming the shape of a strong fabric of vital ties in all fields of party, state, economic, and social life. The "Long-Term Program of Development of Cooperation Between the Soviet Socialist Republics and the German Democratic Republic in the Fields of Science, Engineering, and Production for the Period Until the Year 2,000," signed on 6 October 1984 is a new confirmation of this. Proceeding from the tasks determined by the CPSU and the SED in the field of socioeconomic development and following the line expressed collectively at the Economic Conference, the parties came to an agreement to develop economic and scientific-technical cooperation on a broad spectrum of long-range areas.

This cooperation was given a high evaluation at the meeting of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet K.U. Chernenko with E. Honecker on 14 June 1984; this meeting became an important new stage in the development of friendly relations between our countries. It was emphasized that it plays an ever greater role in fulfilling plans for building communism and socialism outlined by the 26th CPSU Congress and the 10th SED Congress.

The Soviet people marked the 35th anniversary of the German Democratic Republic as a great common holiday. They wish the fraternal people of the GDR, our ally, comrade-in-arms, and friend, prosperity and new successes in the interests of peace and socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

12424

CSO: 1816/8

MEMO SERIES ON CAPITALIST STATES: VOLUME ON FRANCE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 11, Nov 84 pp 130-132

[Review by A. Salmin of book "Frantsiya" (France), edited by G.G. Diligenskiy, doctor of historical sciences, and V.I. Kuznetsov, doctor of economic sciences, Izdatel'stvo "Mysl'", Moscow, 1982, number of copies not given, 431 pages]

[Text] Researchers at the Institute of World Economics and International Relations are once again turning to the comprehensive analysis of contemporary French society.¹ The monograph under review, a kind of continuation of the previous ones, is devoted to the 1970's and the early 1980's. The complexity of conducting such comprehensive research consists, among other things, in that its sphere of social life has its own rhythm and its own cycle of development.

From an economic standpoint the period being examined by the authors is clearly divided into two stages -- before and after the crisis of 1974-1975. As the work notes the French economy was developing at a relatively high rate for the course of three postwar decades. The average annual increase in aggregate social product in 1950-1973 was 5.1 percent, which made it possible to triple the volume of aggregate social output (p 26).

The structure of production changed quite rapidly, its technical level increased, and labor productivity grew. France actively entered into international division of labor and on the whole the country's largest companies were competing successfully on world markets. The crisis of 1974-1975 led to an appreciable and steady decline in the savings norm. Difficulties in selling output in both foreign and domestic markets increased, inflation was sharply intensified, the utilization of production potential was curtailed, technical progress and the growth of labor productivity decelerated, and production efficiency was reduced. All this led to a drop in production rates. The average annual increase in industrial output totaled only 1.5 percent in 1973-1980 (p 26).

A thorough study of the precrisis situation as well as the mechanism of the 1974-1975 crisis, the 1974-1980 cycle, and the 1980-1981 crisis enabled the authors to convincingly disprove the idea that the increase in prices for oil

which OPEC member-countries resorted to was the basic cause of the unhealthy development of the French economy. Data on the reduced efficiency of social production and its increased specific costs demonstrate that a disproportionality of the process of reproduction of capital developed in the precrisis years, which, other conditions being equal, attests to an overaccumulation of capital. This overaccumulation, however, did not manifest itself in a reduced profit norm for a long time. This occurred because, by taking advantage of the potential of state power, entrepreneurs managed to fundamentally change the proportions of redistribution of newly created value in their favor and thereby in time to retard the development of an unfavorable trend in the profit norm level.

Obvious signs of the overaccumulation of capital appeared in France long before the fall of 1974 when the crisis decline in industrial production began. The extremely profound yet at the same time natural drop in the profit norm, prepared by the entire process of previous development, during the 1974-1975 crisis determined the main features of the 1974-1980 economic cycle. And the circumstance that not only cyclical and internal factors but foreign and structural ones as well were among those which caused this drop made it difficult to overcome the consequences of the overaccumulation of capital.

The study emphasizes that "in the second half of the 1970's, French capitalism simply did not manage to fully restore the value proportions of reproduction violated in the first half of the decade." In the period after the crisis "it became increasingly clear that increased production efficiency in France would have to be achieved through fundamental reorganization of the sectorial structure and through determined specialization of the national economy within the framework of international division of labor; the success of this specialization depended primarily on global technical and technological reorganization of the French production apparatus" (pp 134,138). The political superstructure which had certain economic power in conditions of state-monopoly capitalism could have played its role in preventing the difficulties which arose. Nonetheless, in the second half of the 1970's, "the economic policy of the French government was distinguished by an odd combination of neoliberal phrases and measures with classical directive actions in certain spheres and sectors. And this did not promote the integrity of policy or its consistency" (p 138).

The sociopolitical sphere had a slightly different profile of development than that found in the economy in the period reviewed in the monograph. The "benchmark" here begins with the events of May-June 1968, which seriously shook the entire superstructure of French society. "The unusually broad scope of the strike struggle, its mass involvement, its active and highly organized nature, and the consciousness and initiative of the strike participants demonstrated the increased forces of the working class and its increased potential in the cause of defending its interests" (p 244).

The activization and radicalization of the socioeconomic struggle of the workers is explained to a great extent by the profound qualitative changes in the structure of French society in the postwar period. In analyzing this structure, the authors single out two determining features of its development -- the rapid increase in the number of people engaged in hired labor and the

sharp increase in their ratio in the gainfully employed population: from 66 percent in 1954 to 84 percent in 1980 (p 188). The change in the country's demographic situation -- the higher population growth rate and the increase in the number and ratio of disabled -- also played a large role. To a great extent the accentuation of such important social problems as the rate of employment of young people who had completed their studies and the inadequacy of social security for the elderly is related to this situation, although, as the study accurately notes, "the sources of these problems undoubtedly lie in another area -- the production relations of capitalism" (p 188).

One of the most important political results of the socioeconomic struggle which developed in the late 1960's-early 1970's was the formation in 1972 of the union of leftist forces to which, as the monograph notes, "most workers tied their hopes for profound changes in the country's economy and policies" (pp 243-244).

The sharp decline in economic growth, the instability of the country's foreign economic position, and the deterioration of the workers'situation -- all these factors "worked" against the rightwing and centrist parties which had been in power since 1958, to the benefit of the alternative program of actions the leftist coalition had presented. All the more so since in the program of the leftist forces a return to a high rate of development, the fight against unemployment, and improvement of the position of the poorly-paid and unfortunate strata of the population were made paramount and reflected the hopes of the broad strata of voters.

The culmination point of French history of the 1970's-early 1980's was the victory of leftist forces in the 1981 parliamentary and presidential elections, the formation of a government in which the communists participated, and the attempt to implement a number of progressive reforms in economic, social, and domestic policy spheres. The authors of the monograph mention only the first of these reforms. Nonetheless, the conclusion the work contains on the complexity and ambiguity of the tasks facing the executive power in combination with the unfavorable international situation and the discontinuity of the political base on which it relied was fully confirmed. Of course, the real results of the activity of the leftist government proved to be less than initially anticipated, the leaders of the socialist party rejected a course toward radical reforms, and the communists abandoned the government in the changed socioeconomic situation.

What are the causes of this development of events? The analysis conducted in the work offers an opportunity to answer this question. In the 1960's-1970's, the power of monopolistic capitalism increased in France and French transnational companies, whose interests went far beyond the boundaries of national territory and intertwined with the interests of American, West German, and English capitalists, appeared and strengthened their positions. Linked by myriads of strong invisible threads with the world capitalist system and made strong by these links, in the 1980's French monopoly capital became an difficult obstacle in the path of progressive reforms.

The analysis of France's foreign policy conducted in the monograph is of great interest. All its major directions were studied -- relations with the USSR

and other socialist countries, its European Economic Community partners, the United States, and developing countries. In evaluating the foreign policy activity of G. Pompidou and V. Giscard d'Estaing, the authors justifiably note that it "included both important precepts of the DeGaulle period and fundamentally new elements" (p 328).

As is well-known, France was one of the first countries in the West to speak out for overcoming the division of Europe. Beginning in 1959, the founder of the 5th Republic, General Charles DeGaulle continually emphasized that the states of both parts of the European continent should search for and find paths toward reconciliation and then cooperate with mutual benefit. Among Western countries, it was precisely France which was the initiator of the policy of detente and cooperation. It played a substantial role in preparing the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The leaders of the 5th Republic invariably followed DeGaulle's well-known formula "detente -- agreement -- cooperation." In the 1970's this course retained all its major elements. Concerning the position of the French government on the problems of European security, based on the situation in late 1981, the monograph notes, it "was not distinguished by adequate realism" (p 406). And this was especially noticeable in military-strategic questions and relations between capitalist and socialist countries, which had become paramount. Moreover, as the authors of the study under review note, the aggravated international situation which had been created in the early 1980's -- the fault of aggressive and reactionary imperialist forces, above all American ones -- makes the "preservation and when possible strengthening and development of everything good that was accumulated during the fruitful Soviet-French cooperation in the 1960's-1970's" very important (p 408).

Of course, like any work of such scope, the monograph under review has certain shortcomings. So, the authors could be reproached since in the chapter where the mechanism of the 1974-1975 economic crisis is analyzed, the general nature of the latter was given parenthetical treatment. A certain haste which led to a sometimes disorganized arrangement of factual material is felt in the description of events after May-June 1981.

But on the whole the book under review is an unquestionable success by the author collective; they have managed to present and analyze the basic problems facing today's France in concentrated form and on a high scientific level.

FOOTNOTE

1. See "Problemy ekonomiki i politiki Frantsii posle vtoroy mirovoy voyny" [Problems of the Economy and Politics of France after World War II], Moscow, 1962; "Frantsiya" [France], Moscow, 1973.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

12424

CSO: 1816/8

A. ARBATOV BOOK ON STRATEGIC PARITY REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 11, Nov 84 pp 138-140

[Review by A. Likhotal' of book "Voyenno-strategicheskiy paritet i politika SShA" [Military-Strategic Parity and US Policy] by Aleksey Arbatov, Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, Moscow, number of copies not given, 318 pages]

[Text] The first thing that the readers of this book will certainly note is its timeliness. In analyzing American policy of the 1970's-1980's, on the basis of broad factual material, part of which is introduced for the first time into scientific circulation, the author shows its aggressive orientation and reveals the nature of the interdependence between the development of new weapons systems and foreign policy precepts and strategic doctrines of American imperialism. The hidden motives of Washington's forced participation in negotiations with the USSR on arms limitation are identified and the demagogic methods of the foreign policy propaganda of the United States which is expected to "justify" its militaristic course are convincingly exposed.

The monograph examines the impact of strategic parity on U.S. policy in detail. A. Arbatov notes that on the political level, "parity more and more severely limited American opportunities to use the nuclear threat in the international arena, reduced the validity of their obligations on using nuclear weapons first, built into the foundation of NATO and other aggressive blocks of imperialism, and made the direct or indirect use of military force in general more difficult in various crisis regions of the world" (p 77).

An unquestionable service of the author is in posing the question of the stability of strategic parity since "the prospects of preventing thermonuclear war, curbing the arms race, and even all further development of world politics depend to the greatest extent" on the answer to this question (p 242). In analyzing this question, he intently scrutinizes the material character and nature of strategic parity. The books shows very clearly that changes in the ratio of military forces in combination with the steadily strengthened world positions of socialism and other progressive changes in the world have determined the fundamentally new global-strategic situation. The impossibility of nuclear attack with impunity has become its main feature. With any conceivable variants of the start of war, the aggressor cannot escape

a destructive retaliatory strike. Even in the most unfavorable conditions, the object of nuclear aggression is able to preserve sufficient means to do "intolerable damage" to the aggressor in a retaliatory strike and thereby deprive him of the opportunity to emerge from the war as the victor.

We will note that certain of the author's statements in this area look somewhat contradictory. Thus, on the one hand, the work completely justifiably confirms that strategic parity is a "major political concept" (p 5), and on the other -- this concept is reduced to a certain "equality of strategic nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States" (pp 7, 266, 298). It is true that this contradiction in statements did not stop the author from drawing the correct conclusion: strategic parity "has a substantial margin of safety or stability which makes it more difficult for one side to violate it than for the other side to prevent these attempts" (p 247).

The developed and well documented criticism included in the book of scholastic theories and theories devoid of any military-political reality, which are supposed to legitimize certain "rules" of conduct of nuclear war and to control nuclear escalation in the event "the check does not work," is unquestionably valuable. In clarifying this question, A. Arbatov notes that any nuclear escalation will only be the result of premeditated first use of nuclear weapons (excluding the unsanctioned use, for which there are appropriate international agreements). "This step would be the most monstrous crime against humanity in all its history. Any use of nuclear weapons would be crossing the Rubicon, threaten the vital interests of other states, and immediately entail full-scale destructive retribution" (p 258). And not only does the author prove the futility of the abstract and pseudoscientific concepts of American "theoreticians" but also demonstrates in addition their colossal danger to the cause of peace.

In the same way, in evaluating the United States' approach to problems of curbing the nuclear arms race, the author does not restrict himself to the dynamic development of the main events in this area or an account of the activities of Washington diplomacy, but also tries to find the weak spots in the corresponding conceptual constructs. The criticism of the concept of "strategic stability" with its artificial selection of "destabilizing" strategic systems or the particular tactical-technical features of certain types of weapons appears very convincing. On the basis of a detailed and considered analysis of possibilities for using various types of nuclear weapons, the researcher proves that this concept "has been converted under the present administration into an instrument to arbitrarily demolish the methods which have developed for evaluating the military ratio of forces" (p 269).

The pages devoted to the decision-making process in Washington on major military-political questions are read with great interest. Using the example of such important military programs as the MX, the B-1, and Trident, the author has managed to convincingly show the most complex intertwining of the interests of different bureaucratic departments and pressure groups and to demonstrate, so to speak, the "coordinated work" of the military-industrial and political-academic complexes of imperialism to step up the arms race. The reader receives detailed information which confirms that the strategic policy of the United States is aimed not simply at increasing nuclear might but at

fundamentally reorganizing the strategic arsenal and giving it "qualitatively new strategic and operational capabilities" (p 220).

We will direct attention to yet another feature of the monograph. For the first time in Soviet literature, the meanings of a number of special terms, ideas, and concepts are introduced into circulation and revealed in the monograph. This initiative can only be welcomed: the popularization of special knowledge to a great extent can make it easier to orient oneself in complex military-political problems to what is in the interests of developing contemporary international relations.

The book under review convincingly shows that the world has entered a period of increasing dangers related to the plans and actions of the reactionary imperialist circles of the United States and NATO. The author does not nourish illusions of the relative seriousness of the situation, whose determining factors can have a long-term character by virtue of specific features of American political life (pp 144-145). We will note in passing that against the background of this, in our opinion, true evaluation, the political characterization of R. Reagan as a politician whose "life experience and professional baggage, apart from his success in Hollywood, was limited primarily to activities on the level of governorship of the state of California (that, we will note, is not all that little, considering the importance of California in America's political life -- reviewer) and political activity within the framework of the right wing of the Republican Party elite" (p 141) appears superficial.

In evaluating the situation which has taken shape, the author also avoids excessive dramatization, pointing out that there is no foundation to attribute the ability to determine the general direction of world events to imperialism, since the opportunities it has to carry out its criminal intrigues are severely limited in the contemporary epoch (pp 92, 243, 169, 238).

Imperialism has not taken and is no longer able to take the initiative, even with all the exertion of its forces. The main and decisive obstacle to this is the might of real socialism and the industrious activity of the international communist and worker movement and all progressive forces of contemporary times. It is therefore not surprising that the vain and futile attempts of Washington to "demolish the realities of the contemporary international situation and force them into the bed of Procrustes, divorced from the life of reactionary foreign policy philosophy" have generated sharp criticism of American foreign policy. Colliding with objective conditions, writes the author, "American practical policies have disintegrated into measures which are not only inadequately interrelated but at times directly contradictory to each other and lead to unforeseen results" (p 169).

In conclusion we will note that with A. Arbatov's new book, Soviet American studies has been furthered with a necessary work that is rich in content.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdnarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

12424

CSO: 1816/8

END